

Proceedings  
OF THE  
THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL  
CONVENTION  
OF THE  
Association of  
Colleges and Preparatory  
Schools  
of the Middle States and  
Maryland

1917



HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF  
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30th  
and DECEMBER 1st, 1917.

---

<sup>Emc</sup>  
PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION  
1918

---

---

## NOTICE

---

Extra copies of the Proceedings of the Association may be secured without charge from the Secretary by any officer of a College or School holding membership in the Association.

A charge of twenty-five cents per copy is made to those not members of the Association.

The next Convention of the Association will be held at Princeton University, on the Friday and Saturday following Thanksgiving, 1918.

---

---







## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Association .....	5
General Topic: "The Teacher and the Soldier" .....	
James R. Angell .....	7
Discussion .....	15
Business Meeting .....	21
Temporary Committees .....	21
Report of the Treasurer .....	21
Report of the Auditing Committee .....	22
Report of the Executive Committee .....	22
Report of the Delegate to the Conference Committee on Standards .....	23
New Business .....	25
Appointments .....	26
General Topic: "Democracy and Idealism" .....	
John Erskine .....	26
Discussion .....	39
General Topic: "Educational Surveys" .....	
Clyde Furst .....	42
Discussion .....	
Dr. Samuel P. Capen ....	51
List of Members, 1917-18 .....	60
Delegates Registered, Convention of 1917 .....	65

Philadelphia Printing & Publishing Co. (1917-18)



## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1917-1918

### *President*

Headmaster VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, Horace Mann School for Boys,  
New York City, N. Y.

### *Vice-Presidents*

President JAMES H. MORGAN, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penn-  
sylvania.

Dean VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE, Barnard College, New York  
City, New York.

Professor A. J. RIESENBERGER, Stevens Institute, Hoboken, New  
Jersey.

President, The REV. ALPHONSUS J. DONLEN, Georgetown College  
Washington, D. C.

Headmaster W. M. IRVINE, Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg,  
Pennsylvania.

### *Secretary*

Professor GEORGE WM. MCCLELLAND, University of Pennsyl-  
vania.

### *Treasurer*

Principal STANLEY R. YARNALL, Germantown Friends' School,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

### *Executive Committee*

Professor JOHN ERSKINE, Columbia University, New York City,  
New York.

Headmaster F. W. PINE, Gilman County School, Baltimore,  
Maryland.

Dean JOHN C. FELTERMANN, University of Pittsburgh, Pitts-  
burgh, Pennsylvania.

Professor MARIAN P. WHITNEY, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie,  
New York.



PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
**Thirty-First Annual Convention**

---

FIRST SESSION  
Friday, November 30th at 11 A. M.

---

Vice-President CHARLES F. WHELOCK, presiding

---

**THE TEACHER AND THE SOLDIER**

PROFESSOR JAMES R. ANGELL, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
*Member of the Committee on the Classification of Personnel of  
the United States Army.*

The topic assigned to me, "The Teacher and the Soldier," involves an order much larger than I am able to fill. I am really taking the place of Dr. Scott or Dr. Thorndike to report upon a single piece of work being largely controlled by college men, i. e., the work of the Committee on the Classification of Personnel in the Army, a civilian organization working under the authority of the Secretary of War as an adjunct to the office of the Adjutant General.

It is hardly practicable under the present circumstances to give you an intelligible historical account of the work of this Committee. Suffice it to say that by one device or another it is attempting to assist in the Herculean task of sorting out our great new armies, finding the right place for the right man, and then putting him in it. It happens that most of the men who have been chiefly instrumental in getting this enterprise afloat are psychologists, but the task which they have undertaken has many features of the most fundamental importance which are in no usual sense of the term psychological at all.

As most of you know, psychology has for a number of years been actively interested in the devising of tests for various forms of human efficiency. In industry and in education, for

example, great varieties of investigations have been fostered in the attempt to evaluate, and so ultimately to improve, extant practices. It was, therefore, not unnatural that when the United States found itself confronted with war, it should have occurred to a number of people, almost at the same time, that psychology had something to offer which would be of value. Not only were there personal offers of such assistance made to the Government, but the Council of the Psychological Association made an official proffer of such service. As the outcome of these several influences, two main lines of work were instituted. The one had to do with the installment in the Officers' Training Camps of a rating system, which consisted in a modification of a procedure used for commercial purposes and devised by Dr. W. D. Scott and his colleagues at the Carnegie Institute of Technology. The other concerned itself (a) with the problem of detecting the mentally incompetent among the men drafted for the National Army and (b) in the prompt supplying of data regarding the general mental abilities of each individual. This branch of the work has been taken over by the Surgeon General's Office, and is under the immediate supervision of Major R. M. Yerkes, Professor of Psychology in the University of Minnesota.

As I shall not have time to go into a full discussion of this second line of work, which is technically distinct from the work of the Committee on the Classification of Personnel, I may say in passing that these psychological examinations have been installed at four camps, to-wit, Lee, Taylor, Dix, and Devens, and that the work is judged by military authorities to have been so successful as to warrant recommendation that it be extended to the entire army. Action on this recommendation is still pending. If affirmative action be taken, it will certainly tax the psychological resources of the country to supply the necessary numbers of examiners. What will become of the psychological instruction in many of our colleges and universities, I do not venture to predict. Suffice it to say that already in two important institutions known to me the Department of Psychology has either been wiped out altogether or reduced to a mere shadow of its original strength. Evidently if the war is to go on indefinitely, there must be very careful consideration given to the maintenance of adequate facilities for instruction, otherwise we shall be unable to make good the inevitable attrition in the forces of these army psychologists.

With your permission I shall now distribute among you some of the material involved in the use of the rating system for officers. The larger document explains the principle of the scale, and without pausing for you to read it through, I may say that it possesses two distinguishing characteristics. In the first place, as the result of extended conferences with large numbers of army officers, the five most essential points upon which it is desirable to rate candidates for commissions, are set down. You will observe that these relate first, to physique; second, to intelligence; third, to leadership; fourth, to character; and fifth, to general value to the service. The meaning of these several categories is carefully explained, and instead of getting a rough and ready classification of a man in terms of the general impression he makes upon one, the rating officer is compelled to analyze thoughtfully his classifications under each of these five headings. Appropriate numerical values are accorded to these several qualities. The second main point in the system is that each officer rated is measured not by some abstract scale of achievement, but by a concrete comparison with some other officer. In order to make the scale, the rating officer must pick out from his acquaintance in the service five officers under each of the five headings. They need not be the same five officers, but there is no objection to this where the same five can be made to serve. Under physique, for example, the most satisfactory officer is rated highest and the other four in a descending scale of excellence. The candidate for a commission is then compared with each of these five and rated in terms of the individual whom he is judged most nearly to resemble. The same procedure is followed with each of the other qualities.

The successful use of the scale involves careful analysis of the candidate to be judged, and the element of personal comparison greatly increases the chance that he will be estimated in terms of tangible standards, which can be discussed and criticized intelligently. When one recalls the tremendous task involved in selecting from wholly inexperienced and untried material the thousands of officers necessary to command our new armies, the need for some such uniform and definite methods of selection is easily appreciated.

The largest job which our Committee has handled, and from many points of view undoubtedly the most important, is of somewhat different character, and I have brought some docu-

mentary material to illustrate this work also. I think the blanks will explain themselves, even at a first reading. Before commenting upon the general nature of this work, let me call attention to one fact which is not fully recognized. The present war has taught us to appreciate the extent to which technical and scientific devices are essential to a successful campaign. But it is not always realized to how large an extent a technically trained personnel is requisite. Roughly speaking, something like a third of the modern army must be made up of men skilled in some one or other of the trades or industries and used not in the front line trenches, but in the support of such troops by the production or repair of the necessary materials of attack and defense. Out of every three men taken into the army then, one at least must be found who is either already competent for a technical task of this character, or he must be forthwith trained to execute it.

Our Committee has been engaged in finding out the civilian occupations of all of the men in the National Army and the National Guard and, as accurately as possible, their several degrees of skill, in order that they may be placed to the very best advantage in the army organization. To this end there has been appointed in every National Army and National Guard Camp a personnel officer, commonly a Captain, and there has been sent to assist him in the early weeks of his work an expert industrial employment manager from some of the great business concerns of the country. The necessary number of additional officers and enlisted men have been detailed to carry on the work of the office and then by the use of these cards which have been distributed, we secure an indexed list of every man and every occupation represented.

By the system of index numbers printed across the top of the card, it is possible to determine with a single glance of the eye all the mechanics, or all the cooks, or all the farriers, in any regiment or other unit. This is made possible by attaching a little colored flag or celluloid marker which projects above the appropriate number, in the case of mechanics, number 6. These cards are all placed in a tightly fitting box, and as the eye looks down the line, all the mechanics will be behind the number 6 of the front card and will show clearly as a column. If another regiment or another division needs more mechanics than it has, and this regiment can spare them, the operation of finding them takes only so long as is required to lift out the necessary number of



cards marked on the index number 6. As a matter of fact, there would generally be a number of considerations to be taken into account and considerably more cards are likely to be examined than the number actually called for. But at least you have all the facts before you in a peculiarly convenient type of index.

A good many men have followed more than one calling, or at least can do more than one thing with some degree of expertness. In this case the highest degree of skill is marked with a green flag, the lesser degree of skill with an orange flag. You will understand at once that when we have exhausted all the most highly skilled men in a given field, e. g., electricians, we can then fall back on the less highly skilled in preference to attempting to train wholly unskilled individuals.

The occupations actually listed are relatively few in number and represent those most frequent demands which the army officers reported to us. As a matter of fact, the list is very incomplete even from that point of view, and it will be observed that at the bottom of the list there is a blank in which may be entered any occupation or form of skill other than those not entered above. These are all flagged under the letter S, "Special," and are then, whenever necessary, indexed in a separate list.

You will notice that apart from the entries regarding industrial experience, data are secured regarding the man's educational history, regarding his previous military experience, and also regarding his preferences concerning the branch of the service in which he desires to be enrolled.

As the result of the information thus gathered, it has been possible to meet the many demands for special kinds of skilled workers which are constantly received from General Pershing, and it has also rendered practicable the transfer from one division to another of all such men as were needed, to say nothing of the possibilities which the system obviously offers for balancing the personnel in the various units of the division itself.

It would be quite misleading to suggest that the working of the system has been unequivocally successful. So far as concerns the distribution of the men inside each division, the success or failure of the plan has been largely determined by the forcefulness and activity of the officer in charge of the work. In some divisions it has gained almost instant recognition and been used by the commanders of all the units with great success. In other divisions it has been far less significant.

The difficulty which the Committee is now attempting to forestall in the case of further drafts has arisen from the necessity of determining with more precision than the questionnaire on the card will permit, the exact degree of skill which a particular soldier possesses. He may, for example, report himself as a mechanic, and when actually confronted with the tasks of a mechanic, show himself wholly unacquainted with many important tools and machines and quite unable to execute any but the simplest operations. To offset this difficulty which has probably at times arisen through ignorance on the part of the recruit and not from any desire to mislead, we are establishing trade tests, by means of which in the more important trades at least, we can by actual experiment quickly determine what grade of work the man is competent to perform. In many branches of the service these tests are sure to be found of immense value.

The military authorities at Washington have been confronted with the repeated embarrassment of deciding, as between two competing interests, which might be the more imperative. Obviously, if you subtract from a company just in process of development half a dozen of its most important non-commissioned officers, you may practically wreck the entire situation for an appreciable time, and if this process be often repeated, the commissioned officers of the company are driven to absolute despair. It repeatedly happens that the ablest men from the point of view of the trades needed by the army are found in these responsible posts. The dilemma, therefore, which confronts the War Department is that of deciding whether to take such important men from a particular division in order promptly to meet a demand from General Pershing, for example, or whether on the other hand to let the company alone and try to secure the necessary men in some other way. Great hardship has unquestionably been suffered in some cases by particular divisions and particular regiments as a result of this situation. But without such information as the work of the Committee has put at the disposal of the Government, the difficulties would have been enormously multiplied.

The limits of time prevent my attempting to describe in any detail the other enterprises which the Committee has been engaged upon. I will mention a few of them very briefly.

We hope to be able to simplify much of the paper work at present required of army officers. Much of it is needlessly cum-

brous and is ill-designed to meet the present needs of the army, however satisfactory it may have been for the old smaller organization. A good deal of it involves duplications which it seems reasonably certain can be avoided.

One of our sub-committees is engaged in attempting to solve certain of the problems in connection with the selection of men for the aviation service. Despite the ungrudging assistance of the aviators of England, France, and Italy, there is available relatively little information to determine the characteristics most essential in the successful aviator. Many of the problems which originate in this question of the psychological characteristic to be desired in men admitted to the flying schools, run over into the problems of physiology, for example, those connected with the question of the effect of high altitudes on mental and muscular control, questions intimately connected with the supply of oxygen. Major Watson, a member of the Committee now in charge of the selection of personnel for the flying division of the Signal Corps, is in charge of this particular branch of investigation, and Dr. Thorndike, Dr. Shepherd, and others are co-operating in the various researches.

Professor Dodge, one of the members of the Committee, has been working on certain problems for the Navy, among others the training of gun-pointers, in which connection he has made some very interesting and significant contributions.

The Committee is also co-operating with the Provost Marshal General's Office in the formulation of a procedure to render available government access to those reservoirs of skilled men subject to the draft.

This hasty outline will perhaps convey to you some impression of the character of the ground covered by the work of the Committee. I appreciate the somewhat disconnected form in which the matter has been put, and I shall be glad to answer any questions which may serve to make clearer the working of any part of our machinery.

Dr. Angell then answered questions put to him by members of the Association as follows:

Q. I should like to ask how long a period is covered by the observations on which this classification is made, and whether there is any provision yet adopted for regarding new members of the army after, say, three or six months?

*Dr. Angell.*—These classifications are made in this fashion: the men are brought up by companies under the charge of an officer, are passed in front of a series of examining officers who sit down with each man and fill out the card for him under his instructions, discussing with him any points that appear difficult or ambiguous; and the result is, the most intelligent card which we can get. It is not expected that there will be any subsequent reclassification *en masse*.

Q. What bearing has this classification on boys and girls and young men and young women in our institutions of secondary and higher learning? Does it mean that they should stay there until they are called out?

*Dr. Angell.*—My reply is largely the expression of an opinion. The present policy of the government is to exempt no students within the age limits of the draft, except medical and divinity students, and medical students only partly. My personal opinion is, that we have got to take another and a very important step, because it is perfectly clear that if the draft goes forward on its present basis and the army need for engineers, continues to increase at the rate it has in the last six months, to take nearly all of the two upper classes out of the engineering institutions, as the draft may do, is going to put us flat on our backs for engineers inside of the next two years.\* That is simply one illustration of a great many. I think the government is going to be obliged to reconsider its policy, simply in its own defence; not because it wishes to make unfair discrimination in the draft at all, but because war is a national business in these days, and we have got to face it as such. If apparent discriminations occur, we have got to make them, for that is the price we pay for all-around efficiency in the army organization.

Q. I should like to ask one question here. It seems puzzling why there was no classification made as between the elementary school, the high school, and the college on this card. Here they are all put in under one head, 51. That would simply show you that the man is a graduate of one of those three institutions, but not which one.

*Dr. Angell.*—We provide for that by putting a check mark under the number which is flagged. All those things are flagged under 51, but over at the side we enter in pencil or pen a code

\*Since this was stated the government has modified the previous ruling in favor of a certain number of engineering students.

number which indicates that precise thing you asked for. That was necessary in order to keep the code numbers within reasonable limits.

Q. I would ask if any complaint has come to Washington concerning the mental condition of many of the draft members from Alabama, sent to Camp Mills. I have heard a number of stories concerning a large percentage of men of subnormal mentality.

Dr. Angell.—Nothing has come to me. We have no psychological examination in that camp, and we could get indication of such a condition only indirectly.

DISCUSSION :

*Professor Margaret Floy Washburn* (Vassar College), applying the subject to work that may be done in schools and colleges, spoke of the tests which psychologists have devised as a means of selecting the ablest and least able ten or fifteen per cent. of a given group of individuals. Such tests may profitably be made early in the career of the students so that it may be determined whether subsequent successes or failures are attributable to native ability, to previous preparation, or to the other factors that enter into every case. These tests must, of course, be standardized by something besides themselves: by comparison and correlation with actual college or school grades, or by reference to estimates of general ability made by teachers and other people who have come into contact with the student previously.

It is possible, the speaker maintained, to get very good objective estimates of mental ability. You can pick out ten students that you have known particularly well and grade them in order. The student whose ability you wish to judge can then be compared with one of those standard individuals. Less satisfactory is the method of determining ability by taking five different grades and deciding in which of the five to place the student under consideration.

The determining of special abilities is another matter. As yet no successful tests for vocational guidance have been devised. Professor Washburn, however, gave an account of what is being done at Vassar by way of classifying undergraduates according to estimates of special abilities and special traits of character. Blanks are sent to the wardens, the social heads of the dormitories, on which may be registered the warden's opinion of a given student with regard to five qualities: leadership, reliability, judgment,

industry, and co-operation. The opinion may be given by a grade on a scale of five. The same blanks are to be put into the hands of the student heads of halls, and, with the co-operation of the Students' Association, into the hands of student chairmen of committees. It is hoped also that members of the faculty will furnish estimates of a somewhat different set of abilities: accuracy, originality, logic, industry. With such estimates on file the college or school has at least a basis for vocational guidance.

Upon being asked to mention certain tests already standardized, Professor Washburn said:

That is, of course a large question. I will mention some of the simplest. We have, of course, tests of memory. Those are obvious. We have a very useful test which is called the *opposites test*. A series of words denoting certain qualities or ideas are given and the person tested is required to reply to each word with the word which denotes the opposite of that quality. For instance the word "soon" and the word "late." We have another interesting test which is called the *directions test*, which has two forms, an easier and a more difficult form. It consists in requiring the person to follow certain directions on a printed sheet. The directions are of a very heterogeneous sort; the student must do many different and quite unexpected things in a short time, and the time is taken. We have *vocabulary tests*; we have *cancellation tests*, which require that the individual shall cross out, for instance, a particular number every time it occurs in a page of numbers, or a particular letter every time it occurs in a page of letters; the time again being taken. These are some of the most familiar tests. And while each one of these tests seems trivial taken by itself, the fact remains that there is quite a high correlation, calculated by various possible formulas, between those tests taken in groups and other measures of ability. For instance, four tests which we used last year will enable us to select out the lowest ten per cent. of our last year's freshman class, measured by the college performance in marks, with an accuracy of over 70 per cent. If you consider all the other factors that help to make those marks low, you will agree, I think, that the tests really do something of what we claim.

*Headmaster Eugene R. Smith* (The Park School, Baltimore).—The work I have done has been in a preparatory school, the school I represent, The Park School of Baltimore, having



all grades from kindergarten through high school. For six years we have been testing with the Binet tests all the younger children, as well as all other children who come to us with a poor school history, or who show weakness after entering.

In addition to this we have been keeping a catalog of characteristics as judged by teachers. These include application to school work, attention, carefulness, courtesy, neatness, obedience, perseverance, punctuality, self-control, and steadiness, and a record of whether the teacher sees signs of nervousness or not. All are things that the teacher might judge, some of which directly affect the school work and others of which undoubtedly will affect the pupil in later years.

We also file an unusually thorough physician's report on the student, and by the combination of the characteristic cards, the Binet tests, and the physician's report, we nearly always succeed in finding out what is the trouble when a child does not get on.

The children are also grouped, somewhat as has been said of the college students, as to their ability. As a matter of fact we no longer give regular reports in the first six grades, but send home reports as to the teacher's judgment of native ability, the degree of application of the child, the development of initiative, the teacher's judgment as to mental progress, the physician's statement as to physical progress, the child's social attitude in the school, any aptitude that is beginning to develop, and any weakness in regard to which we expect some home co-operation. We are trying by this system of report cards to judge as well as we can the vital things on which the future of the child depends, rather than to give more or less meaningless marks in a great many school subjects.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

There have been so many requests for information regarding the methods of testing pupils of which I spoke at Poughkeepsie that I am preparing this general statement to cover the main points. I shall be glad to answer further inquiries on specific details.

While much of this work has been under way for over five years, other parts are of new development, as we are constantly trying to broaden the scope of our psychological work.

*General Mental Tests.*—The revised Binet tests (C. H.

Stoelting Co., Chicago), are used. They are given by the Headmaster or the Head of the Kindergarten and Primary Department, both of whom have had sufficient training and experience to interpret them with some accuracy. They are given to all the children who enter the lower grades and to any child who applies for entrance to a higher grade if his previous school record has been poor. They are also used to test other pupils who show signs of dropping back in their work.

While the results from this test should not be considered absolute, they have proved with us a very reliable index of the child's mental condition. In certain cases where further information is needed, other psychological tests are added, such as "opposites," etc. Where our tests indicate the possibility of a serious mental defect, we ask for a confirming examination by the Department of Psychiatry at the Johns Hopkins University.

*Mental Tests Applied through Subjects.*—In the lower grades the Courtis Tests in Arithmetic, the Kelly (Kansas) Tests in Silent Reading, the Ayres (Russell Sage Foundation) Scale in Spelling, the Ayres and Freeman Scales in Writing, and the Thompson Minimum Essentials are used. The school record is plotted in various subjects, and the results are examined both by classes and by individuals. Weaknesses broader than the particular subjects are sometimes found by these methods.

Last year the Peabody Conservatory of Music tested our pupils for Pitch, Rhythm, Musical Appreciation and Voice Quality.

In the High School we are experimenting with some of the tests for languages, mathematics, etc. It is too soon to be sure of the value of any single one of these more advanced tests.

We are at present developing a method for testing eye and ear-mindedness, and for determining the amount of repetition needed by various children to get the content from paragraphs of moderate difficulty. We have proved the need of such work, but are only at the start of our experiments.

*Characteristics.*—Each teacher marks all pupils with whom he or she has any close contact on a number of characteristics that usually appear in school work. The teacher marks (1) satisfactory, (2) fair, or (3) needs special attention, on Application, Attention, Carefulness, Courtesy, Neatness, Obedience, Perseverance, Punctuality, Self-control, and Steadiness. A record



is also made of whether the child is nervous or not, and any special interests, in or out of school, are noted, especially if they are needed to help the school influence the child.

These marks are compiled on a card for each child at the office, and the record is used by the Headmaster, the teachers, and sometimes the parents. The development of a child through a series of years shows very well here.

In addition to these cards, the Headmaster calls as necessary for special written reports on all pupils who are proving to be out-standing problems, whatever the reason. The report must state (1) what seems to be the trouble; (2) what means the teacher is using to help the child; (3) what results are appearing; (4) what advice can be given other teachers having the same child. These reports are also compiled and filed at the office, and have proved most helpful in dealing with both pupils and parents. The opinions are keyed by numbers, so that they can be shown without causing embarrassment to the teachers.

*Physical Tests.*—The school physician is a member of the faculty, and is at the school daily. Examinations of all children are made at least twice a year, and height-weight coefficients are charted. All conditions needing attention are examined more frequently, and each child's physical progress is carefully watched. Our examination card is probably the most complete in use in any school.

*Special Cases.*—Where difficulties are not easily diagnosed, special investigations are made. Such investigations are most searching in all physical and mental details. They sometimes find defects overlooked even by medical specialists. For example, a defect in a boy's retina such that it restricted his area of vision and caused school failure was discovered by the Headmaster in such an examination, although one of the best oculists in the city had the boy in charge and had never even suspected such a weakness.

*Marking.*—In the Primary Department the report cards have the following headings: Ability, Attention, Application, Muscular Control (Big Activities and Handwork), Social Relationship (Classroom and Playground), Strength, Weakness and mental progress.

In the Intermediate Department the headings are: Application, Ability to work independently, Mental Progress, Physical Progress, Attitude, Aptitude, Weaknesses and Remarks.

The marks are given in words, the teacher trying to give the parents as accurate as possible a picture of the child's development during the period in question.

In the Upper School subject marks are necessary for college entrance purposes, but the marks for actual success are modified by numerical subscripts indicating whether the child's attention and application to his work are satisfactory or not. For example, C<sub>1</sub> means that the child has done as well as he could, although his mark is only passing, while B<sub>1</sub> would indicate that while the child's work was good, he was not getting from the subject all of which he was capable. Our criticisms of a child are always made on the numbers, unless the child works hard but inefficiently, in which case we try to improve his methods.

These methods are not supposed to take the place of the teacher's informal judgment of a child, but to supplement and standardize such judgment. As a matter of fact they have made the teachers more alive to their responsibilities in regard to the individual development of each child, and we are convinced that they have proved their value.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

### *Business Meeting*

*Vice-President Wheelock in the Chair*

#### APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY COMMITTEES.

On Nominations: Professor John P. Hoskins, Professor Charles Downer, Miss Olive Hart, Mr. J. G. Miller, Mr. Walter F. Marsh, Chairman.

On Audit: Mr. Frank Rollins, Professor George Gailey Chambers.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF STANLEY R. YARNALL, *Treasurer* IN ACCOUNT WITH ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND, for the year 1916-17, ending November 28, 1917.

##### DEBIT

Balance December 4, 1916 .....	\$287.56
Dues from 1 institution, 1914-15 .....	5.00
Dues from 5 institutions, 1915-16 .....	25.00
Dues from 208 institutions, 1916-17 .....	1,040.00
Dues from 3 institutions, 1917-18 .....	15.00
Interest on deposits .....	10.81
Payment of notary fee .....	.50
Error in crediting check .....	.05
	<hr/>
	\$1,383.92

##### CREDIT

Expenses of annual conference, 1916 .....	\$128.70
Printing .....	468.05
Salaries .....	150.00
Postage, office expenses, etc. ....	124.20
Travel of officers, Executive Committee and Delegates to conferences .....	83.50
Dues .....	10.00
	<hr/>
	\$964.45
Leaving a balance in the hands of the Treas- urer, November 28, 1917, on deposit with the Girard Trust Company, Philadelphia	\$419.47

Four institutions are in arrears for the dues of 1916-17 only; and one institution is in arrears for both 1915-16 and 1916-17.

In accordance with the by-laws of the Association institutions are automatically dropped from membership because of non-payment of dues for three consecutive years.

The Treasurer has made an effort to collect the back dues from the institutions in arrears and has written several letters to each of them during the year.

#### REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We have examined the above account and the accompanying vouchers and find all to be correct as set forth, the balance being \$419.47.

FRANK ROLLINS,  
GEO. GAILEY CHAMBERS.

November 30, 1917.

#### REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Your Executive Committee has met twice during the year for the transaction of business and the arrangement of the program for the annual meeting. Owing to the crisis in national and international affairs it was the sense of the Committee that the subject proposed at the last convention for discussion this year, "The Social Adjustment in Transition from School to College," be set aside to make way for more timely topics.

Twenty-six institutions were admitted to membership, grouped as follows:

*Private Schools.*—Penn Hall, Wenonah Military Academy, Mount Vernon Seminary, The Bennett School, Morristown School, Riverdale Country School, Ogontz School, Miss Chapin's School, Misses Masters' School.

*High Schools.*—High School for Girls, Reading, Pa.; Technical High School, Harrisburg, Pa.; Milne High School, Albany, N. Y.; South Philadelphia High School for Girls; Commercial High School, Newark, N. J.; Central High School, Harrisburg Pa.; Central High School, Altoona, Pa.; West Philadelphia High School for Boys; Julia Richman High School, New York City; and the High Schools at Passaic, Bernardsville, Paterson, Princeton, Englewood, West Orange and Leonia, New Jersey.

*College.*—College of New Rochelle.

After a few minor changes in wording had been made in the Uniform School Record Blank as reported by the Committee, the Secretary was instructed to send a copy of the blank to each college in the district with a letter explaining its intended purpose and urging its adoption.

The Secretary reports that the blank has been adopted either as it stands, or with minor changes not interfering with its essential features, for immediate or future use, by the following twenty-one colleges and universities:

Adelphi College, Albright College, Allegheny College, College of the City of New York, Colgate University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Goucher College, Haverford College, Hobart College, Hood College, Hunter College, Lafayette College, Lehigh University, Manhattan College, New York State College, St. John's-Annapolis, Swarthmore College, University of Maryland, University of Pennsylvania, Ursinus College.

The blank has also been endorsed by the Association of High School Principals of New York City, and is being considered by the faculties of several other colleges that have not yet reached a decision. While no reply has been received from many of the institutions written to, your Committee feels that an encouraging beginning has been made. Only eight colleges have definitely rejected the blank, some of them because they are admitting students by the combination method, others because they prefer not to make any change at this time.

The other members of the Executive Committee desire to express publicly their appreciation of the keen interest and the generous service of the President, Dean Keppel, who, in spite of the great pressure of business in the War Office, has given generously of his time and energy to furthering the welfare of the Association.

GEORGE WM. McCLELLAND, *Secretary*.

#### REPORT OF THE DELEGATE TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS

PRESIDENT FREDERICK C. FERRY.—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: I am sure that I do not need to give a detailed report of the latest meeting of the National Conference Committee, for the reason that the minutes of the meeting have been printed and circulated, supposedly to you all, some time ago. I would

like to call your attention to the fact that this National Conference Committee, which meets annually and has a membership at this time of nine men, has already held eleven meetings. It was organized under the leadership of President George E. McLean, in 1906. It has had in attendance as a member at all of the meetings one man who has been from the first the leading authority on the question of the unit as a measurement of school work. That man is a member of this organization, Mr. Farrand. Except for him the membership has changed from time to time. The questions that have been before it have been in many instances questions of such nature that no final solution seems able to be reached. For example, the question of the certificate board has been considered again and again. The committee has done all it could to encourage the establishment of more certificate boards and the wider use of the approved lists of certificate schools by colleges generally.

The committee has worked as sympathetically and helpfully as it could with the College Entrance Examination Board, repeatedly considering questions of moment to the Board, questions in some instances originated by the Committee and in other instances brought to it by the Board. It has under consideration now the question of the treatment of migrating students; and there again is a question regarding which no final solution will probably be reached, at any rate at any early time; but in that connection the committee has circulated widely, and I think very helpfully, the definition of honorable dismissal and statement of record. It found by sending out a series of questions some years ago that honorable dismissal was often given as a means of persuasion to an undesirable student that he go elsewhere; and it found actually in one instance, at least, that misconduct would be mentioned in the statement of honorable dismissal "unless the misconduct were very serious indeed." It was a desirable line of consideration for the Committee, and there is much evidence that the work of the Committee has been helpful there.

It has championed from the beginning the participation of secondary schools in the framing of college admission requirements. It has dealt more or less with questions of comprehensive examinations. It is considering now, has already reported once, and will report later again on the marking systems which are in vogue in colleges and schools.

The report published from the latest meeting gives a good deal of statistical information as to the marking systems used by all the colleges approved by the Carnegie Foundation. That list shows that a few institutions have three passing grades, i. e., three groups above passing. There is a large group of colleges that have four passing grades. And finally is found one which uses the entire percentage system with two decimal places. It seems worth while to take up that question of the grading of the colleges with an attempt to get a bit more of standardization there.

I am reminded of a professor in French who reported at a faculty meeting in a percentage marking system a mark of 120 for one of his boys; and, when objection was made to it, he stated that they would find that another boy in the class was marked zero, and those two boys were so very unlike in their capacity of accomplishment that they must be 120 points apart; if they would not let him mark this one 120, then he must be allowed to mark the other one 20 below zero.

I received a little while ago an admission record which seemed remarkable, because every grade of the young man was A, throughout the preparatory school course. Somebody wondered whether after all the candidate was so exceptional, and we applied to the school for information regarding its marking system. The principal replied that the marking system in that school involved only two grades, "A" and "Failed."

For the help of the colleges in interpreting the grades that come in from the schools, it seems worth while to take up the question of grading in the schools. Prof. Nicholson, of Wesleyan, reported last year on the question of grading in colleges, and Mr. Farrand will report at the next meeting of the committee on the question of grading in schools.

Such a report as this must be rather a report of progress than a report of a final settlement of any, I think, of the question which that committee considers.

#### NEW BUSINESS

It was suggested by Professor A. L. Jones (Columbia University) that the Association might well follow the examples of the North Central Association and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in giving attention to the value of the degrees awarded by the colleges within the territory.



Professor G. G. Chambers (University of Pennsylvania) thereupon offered the following motion: "That a special committee be appointed to consider the advisability of this Association's taking up the question of determining standards for colleges and universities in the district covered by this Association, and of classifying these institutions accordingly; and, if the committee considers it advisable, to suggest methods of procedure."

This motion was put and carried unanimously after considerable discussion, during which the following suggestions were brought out: that the committee should give consideration to degrees higher than the bachelor's degree, including degrees given for work done by correspondence and not in residence; that it should not attempt to lay down rigid rules regarding the curriculum to be followed for the A. B. degree; that, since the matter of entrance requirements would come up for consideration, the secondary schools should be represented on the committee.

#### APPOINTMENTS

##### BY PRESIDENT KEPPEL:

Delegate to the National Conference Committee on Standards:

President Frederick C. Ferry.

Representatives on College Entrance Examination Board:

Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Principal Frank Rollins, Principal Stanley Yarnall, Headmaster Dwight Meigs, Headmaster Carl Van Doren.

##### BY ACTING PRESIDENT WHEELOCK:

Committee on Standardization of Colleges:

Professor Geo. Gailey Chambers, Dr. Augustus S. Downing, Principal Ralph E. Files, Principal Eugene R. Smith, Professor Adam L. Jones, Chairman.

---

#### DEMOCRACY AND IDEALISM

JOHN ERSKINE, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

##### I

This subject of democracy and idealism would interest us even if there were no war. But it is the war which has forced us to take stock of our democracy—to see how much of it we



have on hand, and how we intend to dispose of it. As citizens we have moments of impatience, when the enemy challenges us to state our objects in the war, and our government does not reply with a facile catalogue. We should like the government, of course, to state precisely what we aim at, and by the statement to overwhelm the enemy with conscience-stricken confusion. But as teachers we ought to know how hard it is to define an ideal. When we are asked, as we sometimes are even in times of peace, just what we are trying to do in education, our gratitude flows toward any man or woman who can answer the question for us.

Most of us do not know our own ideals. What is worse, most of us do not understand what an ideal is. The ways of thought which pass for wisdom in education, in politics, in society today, make little use of the concept or of the word "ideal"; they are far from the humane philosophy which defined that concept and gave us that word; they point somewhat exclusively to nature and to various things called natural—instincts, impulses, emotions; they neglect what alone makes man humane—his intelligent purposes and his intelligent will to pursue them. In current speech the ideal is either the undesirable opposite of the real, or else it is a better world, vainly dreamt of in present conditions. But an ideal, properly understood, is both the child and the father of the real; it is both desirable and practicable; it is the solution of a present need which imagination proposes—imagination, at once directed and subdued by experience, at once restrained and fortified by the will.

Ideals, so defined, are the common steps by which the reason marches. The maid setting the table imagines first a table set, and then imitates the ideal. The tailor imagines a garment made, and then copies it. The merchant contemplates his business as it should be six months hence, and then makes his actual affairs conform to that foresight. In each case the ideal is directed and subdued by experience; the table is set with reference to the needs of the diners and with reference to the supply of food, the garment depends upon the material and upon the needs of the wearer, and the business will be controlled by the amount of the merchant's capital and by the state of trade. In this sense, then, to have ideals means to have a clear

vision of our immediate purposes. In this sense my subject, "Democracy and Idealism," is roughly equivalent to "Democracy and what it wants."

It is not quite enough, however, to know what we want. An ideal is not genuine, even though it be practicable, until our will is enlisted to achieve it. Unless our purposes are fortified by our will to accomplish them, by our will to master the necessary means for their accomplishment, it is obvious that our ideals will not take living form, nor replace in experience the reality which begot them. It is also obvious that unless our ideals are restrained by the will, by a resolve to accomplish them in the known conditions of life, there is no phantasy so wild that it might not be called an ideal. The second half of our definition is important. I venture to repeat: an ideal is the solution which imagination proposes for a present need—imagination, at once directed and subdued by experience, at once restrained and fortified by the will.

With this definition we ask ourselves what our ideals are. For the purposes of the moment, we restate our subject as a double theme—"What democracy wants, and how resolutely it wants it."

## II

If an ideal is a solution to a present need, it is not surprising that nations and individuals should find it hard at short notice to name their ideals. It takes time and reflection to discover what our needs are, or to state them rationally; for to any situation we are likely to react with our whole nature, with emotions much more than with reason. Man, as we are often reminded, is rational only at times, and then usually under compulsion. If the war is one of those crises which force men to think, we must not expect the thinking to be immediately fruitful or satisfying. Not only is it difficult at all times to know ourselves, but there is danger in an hour so emotional of becoming entangled in words—of believing that our ideals are liberty and democracy, without stopping to reflect that the enemy may also be fighting for those words in a quite different sense. There is danger that our ideals, though more than catchwords, may not be completely genuine; they may be pleasant to contemplate, so long as we need not put them into effect. There is danger also of overlooking a fact peculiar

to the United States, that our ideals have been recruited by immigration, and that the ideals of many of our citizens are solutions of needs discovered in the old world, but not perhaps existing here.

At every point in our history, therefore, such an inventory as we are now compelled by the war to make, would have discovered that our ideals were not genuine—not quite what we thought they were. Some of the forefathers came here, we say, for liberty and conscience—an ideal which they had imagined after experience of persecution in Europe. But there is little reason to think that the ideal of religious liberty was at first genuine. In his ironic tale, "Endicott and the Red Cross," Hawthorne portrays the pillory and the stocks which the Puritan liberty-lovers set up at once for those whose doctrine did not agree with theirs. If religious liberty is the one ideal which we have most nearly achieved in this country, our will to achieve it has been developed in response to needs discovered here, not remembered from overseas; we have learned here that religious toleration is necessary to the well-being of the modern state. A second group of our forefathers came here, we say, for political liberty, for equal political opportunity. Not only have we failed to achieve this liberty, but we do not desire to achieve it; it is not a genuine ideal. We wish to retain for ourselves some political opportunities which we withhold from negroes and Orientals. We defend ourselves at times by saying that in this problem economic rather than political equality is involved. Equal economic opportunity, however, is thought by some people to be one of our ideals. They are probably wrong who think so. Emerson was convinced that we deceived ourselves when we talked of economic liberty and maintained a tariff. If these are not genuine ideals, we sometimes hope that at least we have a genuine desire to provide equal opportunities in education. This ideal might indeed be genuine if we understood what it means, but we have misplaced the word "equal," and the theorists of today offer so-called systems which hope to secure, not equal opportunities in education, but identical results. Madame Montessori will see to it that the children of the rich have the same tactile sensitiveness as the children of the streets, and Dr. Flexner

will make sure that our ignorance of the best that has been said and thought in the world is distributed evenly.

But underlying all our present and past ideals, whether genuine or not, lies the assumption that America is an Eldorado—a place where life will yield wealth and happiness without corresponding effort on our part—a place where ideals are realized with slight exertion of the will. This flattering hope was the motive of those hazardous voyages that Hakluyt collected for our delight; it reappears in so recent a book as "An American in the Making," Mr. Ravage's illuminating account of the motives which bring immigrants to this country. His fellow villagers left Roumania and came to New York, he tells us, because a boy who had previously emigrated made a return visit to his native home dressed in a long coat and a silk hat, and the popular imagination soon defined New York as a place where all the villagers had a chance, not of enjoying social and political equality, but of becoming Mayor. So long as the notion of Eldorado persists of our country as a place of special privilege, how can the ideal of economic liberty be genuine? What we are after is not equality of fortune, but success for ourselves above our fellows, or else wealth acquired without effort.

The thought of America as an Eldorado can be made to illustrate still further the transition in which ideals are. What would it mean to us if we developed this subconscious sense of an Eldorado into a frank ideal? With its natural resources, with its climate and location, our country can be made a land of magic; but it must be made—it will not become so without our effort. The Eldorado which the immigrant thinks of is a wild, irresponsible dream, the product of his former poverty and discouragement, but not a complete ideal, since it is not restrained and fortified by the will. Were we determined to bring this dream to pass, were we willing to learn the science and the self-control which must precede this achievement, the old fables of a fortunate land would come true. But to live by habit in the presence of an obvious yet neglected opportunity, may perhaps be the most disastrous experience for morals and ideals; perhaps we have become used to shirking the responsibility which should follow a clear sight of needs and purposes.

## III

What are our ideals now, in the midst of the war? We should not be troubled if it appears that they are quite new—ideals such as our forefathers never dreamt of; the needs that beset us today are also quite new. The danger is not that we should be found inconsistent, or that we should be slow in defining our ideals. The danger is that we may orient our purposes by our temporary enmity with Germany, rather than by our needs—so that Germany rather than our actual situation will direct our efforts. Is it not true that we are beginning to define a patriotic school as one in which the German language is not studied? Are we not beginning to define a good opera season as one in which no modern German opera is produced? How long will it be before we are convinced that a good book is any book not written by a German? There is danger, I say, that we may turn these stupid emotions of the present crisis into articulate and fixed purposes. I for one refuse to accept them as my ideals. Our quarrel with the Germans is deep, and the grounds of it can be stated, but with German music or with the German language we have no quarrel. If there is to be a generation of Americans who neither read nor speak German, and if there is to be, as many fear, an era of suspicion after the war, it is not likely that the Germans will imitate our stupidity and neglect the study of English; they will understand what we are thinking and saying, and we shall keep ourselves in even greater ignorance than we have hitherto been of their interests and aspirations.

If, however, we state our ideals in terms of genuine spiritual needs, as we now understand them, we may define the profound difference between the Germans and ourselves without throwing away the advantages of our position. From the utterances of modern German philosophers, and from the behavior of Germany in the war, we understand that the German ideal is to be natural, in a Darwinian sense. Nature is the scene of warfare and struggle, in which the fittest survive. Nature is also the impulse to survive, and the energy which sustains us in the struggle. This is the prospect which man sees when he looks upon the life of other animals; it should become, Germany thinks, the pattern of man's own conduct. To survive is to be the fittest; the means to survive, different

in different animals, is whatever nature provides. With such a philosophy, the worst brutalities of war, the most cynical betrayal of faith, become excusable because they are natural. It is natural for an animal in hunger to be ruthless at the sight of food—the ruthlessness is unmoral, merely an indication of hunger; it is natural for the fortunate animals to push the less fitted to the wall—the impulse by itself indicates a masterly spirit, likely to survive. This is what we see in nature, I repeat, and man may, if he choose, decide that it is best to go with his native impulses, to be what his innate propensities would suggest, to do what he would have done had he never become civilized—but to do it with more efficiency.

Over against this philosophy we set an ideal of liberty—a kind of liberty which we might not have defined for ourselves had not the war compelled us. Granting that nature is cruel, rapacious and vindictive, we believe that man becomes free only when he liberates himself from these natural tendencies—only when by virtue of his reason and his will he rises into control of nature, directing its tragic caprice to happy uses. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and the leaf blows with the wind, but the sailor is free to sail where he also listeth. If to continue alive be the only ambition for the soul, then the means to life must be had at all costs, even at the cost of other lives; but reason may decide that rather than pay an inhuman price, it is better not to save ourselves—better to die than to make hunger an excuse for cruelty, better not to succeed than by success to become ignoble. Reason may teach us an ideal of freedom in which the best parts of our old ideals will be summed up and restated—freedom for each man to be human, without the strains of poverty or persecution, and without the more insidious constraint of an inadequate philosophy. When our German friends defend the sinking of the “Lusitania,” on the ground that war is war, and that a nation which still allows negroes to be lynched is in no position to say what is civilized and what is not, we refuse to debate with Germany on such grounds, not because her argument is strong, but because we will not concede the premises of her philosophy. The Germans sank the “Lusitania”; let it be said that we have allowed negroes to be burned at the stake. The profound dif-



ference between us and Germany is that we wish to live in a civilization where such actions are considered crimes.

In one obvious sense the German ideal is dangerous for us; the German has put it into execution, and the logic of it impels him to annihilate us if he can. In more subtle ways also the doctrine that man should be natural is laying siege to our national character, though seldom under a German name—I refer again to those educational theories, and, alas! to those educational practices, which would train—or permit—the young to develop their instincts and impulses, rather than free them from the tyranny of those impulses. But dangerous as this surrender to nature is, it is not so dangerous just now, I firmly believe, as the doctrine of irresponsibility, of anarchy, which spreads fast among us. No ideal is genuine unless the will is enlisted to make it real; and liberty of any kind is but an empty word unless those who shout it and call for it will undertake the responsibility of getting and keeping it. If we are to remain free, we must obviously assume our share in the drudgery of freedom, we must exercise courteous forbearance toward the idiosyncracies of others, and we must keep our promises, even though it be to our own hurt. In the maintenance of intellectual liberty, a liberty maintained by discussion, we must tell the whole truth; it is only the whole truth that will make us free. Clearly we are not in the mood nowadays to assume this particular responsibility. We dislike to tell the whole truth about Germany, because if we did, we should have to mention some admirable qualities, and we wish not to admire the enemy. Similarly we dislike to tell the whole truth of our opponents in political campaigns. We do not concede the numerous successes of the administration which we wish to supplant; if we did, there would be nothing left but to point out, as a lame conclusion, the respects in which we think we could do better. It seems more dramatic to charge the other party with complete failure, and to add broad hints, or even plain charges, that our opponents are crooks. In our academic world, where freedom is essential to the advance of knowledge, we scholars are not always scrupulous to tell the whole truth about those with whom we differ. If we are persuaded that school boards or college trustees fail in this point or that to give scholarship

a proper encouragement, we think we strengthen our case if we suppress the fact that school boards and trustees are not complete failures, but have actually rendered valuable service to education. It seems prudent to many of us, moreover, to suppress the fact that not all teachers take their profession nobly or even seriously. By telling only part of the truth, we do succeed in arousing public clamor, but we conceal the points at which intelligent progress toward intellectual freedom might be made.

The advantages involved in this ideal of liberty are so obvious, that we may well pause to ask why men are not careful to tell the whole truth, are not careful to exercise the utmost self-restraint, in order that at least the liberty we have achieved may be handed down to our children. It is this disposition toward anarchy, a more dangerous enemy, as I said, than the German philosophy, which leads us not to preserve our ideals, but to loot them. Is there some liberty already achieved? Then let us seize all we can of it, let us exercise it without responsibility, let us exhaust it as a selfish tenant might exhaust another man's land; and let the other man restore his inheritance as he may. If ideals are attained in this world by self-discipline and by co-operation, there is always a temptation for the mean man to seize more than his share, without co-operation at all; if only he is the first to do this, he is fairly sure that his more conscientious fellows will for a while at least try to make good his theft by taking extra responsibilities upon themselves. But when too many citizens become anarchists, there are not enough of the conscientious to maintain an ideal for the selfish to loot.

If the ideal of natural force is connected today with the practices of Germany, this ideal of anarchy, of freedom without responsibility, has in the past months been connected, at least in popular thought, with the events in Russia. When we know clearly what is going on in Russia, we shall probably find that other issues are involved than the ideal of anarchy. But for years the doctrine of philosophic anarchism has quite naturally prospered in Russia, and has been imported into the United States. Anarchy as an ideal takes root in countries which have a strong government—whether autocratic or democratic. You can neglect your responsibilities only when some



one else does the work for you. Of course, if your government shoots and hangs the anarchist, he can hardly be said to loot his ideal; but if it deals with him in a less severe way than by killing him, his philosophy compels the government to make some provision for his existence, since he makes none for himself. Should the government collapse, however, it is no more possible to continue to be an anarchist than it would be for Robinson Crusoe on his lonely isle. I know the anarchist agrees that when government comes to an end, anarchy, the negation of government, must also end; but you must first be an anarchist before you are willing to describe life in terms of government and governed, rather than in terms of ideals and responsibilities. The fact remains that in a state where no one else assumes your responsibilities for you, as on Crusoe's isle, you either assume them yourself or you die. You are back in that state of immediate struggle which the German apologists have glorified today.

If this will to be irresponsible arose in Russia, it has found a kindred ideal to blend with in that American persuasion I spoke of, that life here is and should be an Eldorado, an acquisition of unearned wealth and happiness. We are individualists, we say; but we must in frankness describe ourselves most precisely. The Renaissance man was an individualist. He desired to develop to the utmost every talent he had, for the sake of a large career and a lasting fame. We do not particularly wish to develop our talents nor the resources of our country; such a wish involves patience, determination, drudgery. What we wish is to avoid responsibility. So strong is our selfishness, that even those political philosophies which rest entirely on the ideal of life in common, soon disintegrate when imported to our soil. The socialists in America today are rapidly becoming anarchists. The ideal of a state responsibility for the individual they still cling to, as all anarchists do; but they say nothing of the individual's responsibility for the state. In the present war they have criticized the government, and they have imputed evil motives to those who see an essential difference between the German ideal and ours; but so far as I know they have at no time said or done anything which would increase the individual's sense of responsibility toward society in this time of need. It is the non-social-

ist today who is doing the social things—conserving the food supply, regulating prices in the interest of the state, organizing the relief of the destitute, bringing medical science to bear not only upon the care of wounded soldiers, but upon the improvement of the common health now and after the war. The professional socialist profits from our carrying out of what were once his professed ideals, but he is not helping to carry them out—or if he does help, he is so out of tune with his organized party that he resigns, or is summarily dismissed from it. In the confusion of our emotions we say that the socialist is spreading a German influence among us; but to say this is to fail to discriminate among our perils. Whatever else Germany is, it is a social state, and though it might be willing for war purposes to see anarchy spread in Russia and in the United States, it knows the danger of anarchy, and is as far as possible from entertaining it as an ideal. But in our democracy, among a growing number of us, the enjoyment of liberty without responsibility is an ideal, and one illustration of its influence is this tendency of the socialist party to evade common responsibility.

But without responsibility, can we have an ideal? In our definition of an ideal, a genuine purpose implies the will to realize that purpose. We shall always be individualists, let us hope; we shall always be ready to stand for the ideal which to the best of our knowledge is the proper answer to our needs—we shall be true to our ideal even if public opinion disagrees with us. It is only in the brutal state of nature that all animals of the same kind conform approximately to one program of conduct; when the mind is free, there will be differences of opinion and increasing differences of character; and there will be occasional martyrs. Unfortunately, there are no martyrs in our democracy. Martyrdom is an art for which we have no longer the gift. We are willing to preach doctrines that get us into trouble, but we are not willing to abide by the consequences or to sustain the responsibilities of our preaching. Last year two boys connected with my own university were arrested for attempting to print a pamphlet which advised opposition to the draft law. Under the advice of counsel supposed to be mature, and no doubt in conformity with their own impulses, they pleaded that they were indeed responsi-

ble for the pamphlet, but if they had not been arrested for another twenty-four hours, they would have changed it so as not to have committed a seditious act. They were, of course, convicted. A graduate of the university said to me shortly afterward that these young men were a disgrace to us. I agreed with him, but said that my reason for thinking them a disgrace to the university was probably not the same as his. If they had been genuinely opposed to the draft law, and had felt compelled to preach against it, and had maintained their position before the court, I should still have thought them in the wrong, and I should have felt that any self-respecting government must punish them, but I should not have thought their conduct disgraceful. If they came into my course in literature, would I not be holding up for their admiration a Milton or a Thoreau, or some other honored spirit who, standing out against the majority, was perhaps in error, but who was staunch to an ideal? To waste the time of the community, however, by preaching a revolt which you are not willing to suffer for, is to behave no more nobly than the naughty boys on the street corner who try to annoy the policeman without getting caught. These young men behaved disgracefully, since they failed to take the responsibility of their ideals. I go further; I say that they and whoever advised them—and, alas! too many citizens in our country—do not appear to know what an ideal is for.

#### IV

In an hour of conflicting ideals, can one be neutral? We teachers are said to be more reluctant than other men to take sides in the present war. We are, it may be, so shocked at what seems to us the failure of the intellectuals in Germany to take a scientific attitude toward this cataclysm, that we hesitate to resemble them even to the extent of avowing loyalty to our own country. A fair mind ought to understand this hesitation, since it is impossible that any country should be entirely right in all its actions; yet a fair mind ought to understand also how speedily a neutral attitude will bring the suspicion of disloyalty. If ideals grow out of actual needs, every ideal grows out of the needs of a particular place at a particular moment, and loyalty to that ideal carries with it a vital interest in that place and that moment. The passion

for the very soil ought to accompany idealism. We need not be surprised if earnest men look askance at the so-called internationalism which attaches its ideals indiscriminately to all places alike, or to no place in particular. They feel rightly that to be neutral in such a fashion is to be in an aggressive sense unfriendly to the ideals of the community in which we live.

Of course, the teachers who have tried to be neutral in this war can give reasons for their attitude. Some of us are persuaded that civilization will be in the hands of the country which wins the war, and we cannot now tell positively which side is going to win, nor what new ideals the conditions after the war will bring forth. To take this attitude, however, is to evade the responsibility for the ideals we now hold; it is to lay upon someone else the burden of making a choice. To those who are neutral till they see who can win, we might recommend the example of the Children in the Fiery Furnace, who thought their god could save them, but whether he could or not, they had no doubt as to which was their god. It is not essential for a man or a nation to win; it is essential to go with one's own kind, and to put one's ideals to the test.

Another group of teachers hesitate to state their ideals just now, because of the educational theory already twice referred to. Education, they think, should draw out the student's personality; the teacher should stand by as a kind of umpire or encourager, but always with his own ideals in abeyance. The difficulty with this theory is that the children will teach each other, and children are never neutral in their ideals. If the teacher tries to withhold a directing influence, the ablest students will direct the thinking of the others—often toward conclusions which a more mature mind will not approve.

Another group of teachers hesitate to speak of their ideals in this present war for a reason with which we all sympathize. They are beyond the fighting age themselves, they say, or, being women, they would not be called on to risk their lives; how, therefore, can they hold before their students an ideal which would lead some of those students to an early grave? The question is one to make us pause. But have we never before devoted our students to an ideal—even to an ideal which might end in danger?

A few evenings ago a distinguished surgeon of the British army was telling us of a young Scotch doctor who was severely wounded in the beginning of the war. Knowing that there was no other doctor in that part of the line, he refused to be taken to the rear for the attention which would have saved his life, but lay in the muddy trench caring for the stream of wounded brought to him, until he fainted and was carried off to die. When he decided to give his life for the soldiers he could help, we do not know what his opinion was of the survival of the fittest or of one's right to a place in the sun. But we do know that he had an ideal and sustained it; and if it had been our teaching which devoted him to that ideal, we should have no regrets—except to wish that we, too, might have sustained our ideals so well.

#### DISCUSSION

*Principal Lucy L. Wilson* (South Philadelphia High School for Girls) painted a picture of the social life in a little New England village at the time of her early adolescence. What seemed to be democratic ideals prevailed. Lack of education and lack of knowledge did not keep out of the circle one who was known to be good. It was not a democracy, however, because the rich man was beyond the pale. No attempt was made to release his soul or his mind from the bondage of his riches, and the society of the village lost what it might have gained from him, had he been made free.

Democracy in the school, the speaker added, is a recognition of the fact that every child has within him a contribution. The school cannot have a great ideal unless to it is contributed from time to time whatever is within each child, however poor, however unintellectual, however apparently remote from the good things of the spirit.

As a concrete illustration Mrs. Wilson told of a clever girl in her school called upon suddenly to substitute for another in a performance of "The Melting Pot." When she first read the lines of the part, her pronunciation was so inadequate that it seemed impossible that in two weeks she could be made to represent a member of the Russian aristocracy with any semblance of reality; yet her teacher, Miss Hart, recognizing that language is an organ of the mind, succeeded so well in changing

the girl for the time being into a Russian baroness that it is doubtful whether any girl in any school could have spoken better.

That more children do not so develop is due to a vicious circle in education that is vicious. The teachers teach as they themselves have been taught, from the outside. There has not been consequently an appeal to what is within the children that is fine and noble that they can contribute towards a big ideal. True democracy should recognize the queen in every woman and ask her to give as well as to receive it.

*Rev. Joseph A. Dunney* (Albany Diocese) continued the discussion of the theme, giving emphasis to the following points:

Democracy and Idealism, inseparably yoked, belong to every truly American disposition. For over a century our Democracy has been in the spotlight for our neighbor nations. Nothing being clearer than that our spirit is affecting the entire life and thought of mankind, it remains for us to inquire: What sort of lead are we giving? Whereby can the noblest of all efforts ever made at self-government be maintained an enduring fact?

All nations, whether they are advert to it or not, have an ideal base or lofty. The true ideal must needs be a working ideal. It is not enough to cherish an ideal in the heart; we must also profess it with our lives. Strength increases in the measure that we increase in ourselves the ability to do with ourselves what we wish, what is eternally desirable.

In the ideal, every erg of our political energy as a whole body should be used aright and made to tell for our national well-being. The life, health, and human development of the least as well as the greatest of its members, is of serious concern, since Democracy is government of the people, by the people, for the people. Accordingly the activity of the body politic energizing aright ought to be directly exercised or controlled by the people collectively and not by purse-proud millionaires or privileged classes any more than by hide-bound hacks of political adventurers. If our march would be uninterrupted we must watch our army of the people and observe its difficulties, its dangers, its faults, its failures; and save it no less from a false individualism than from political imperialism.

If idealism would introduce itself aright and win the confidence of democracy it must be both sane and sharp-sighted and occupy itself with the pitiful facts of this real world. If democ-



racy would meet and kiss idealism, it must be honorable and sincere. Else they cannot come to any agreement.

At once, then, let us as true educators, wake up to the fact that the three foes of true democracy are ignorance, indifference, and incompetency. They are the deadly enemies lurking at the gates of national prosperity and threatening that citadel of state whose four walls are character, experience, efficiency, and patriotism.

Ignorance is the greatest enemy in a State built upon democratic principles. The want of knowledge of such matters as intelligent citizens ought to know opens the door to civic decay. Akin to this is a moral illusion. Multitudes are misled into the fundamental error that denies the original taint in man's nature; they imagine that since we are fairly relieved of restraints, oppressions, and injustices of the dead past, therefore we spring heavenwards, naturally tending to higher modes of thought and conduct, to purer and worthier life. Nothing could be more untrue. The natural course of society is downward. Ignorance precludes the possibility of its rising to its feet and looking upward. The law of human liberty must rest upon intelligence, which in a democracy must distrust the select few no less than the dreaded masses, since no class as a class is in its eye wanted to govern.

The next foe is Indifference. There seems to be a darkling obliviousness to the obligations of patriotism and the responsibility of citizenship. The ideal democracy would have each of its subjects above and palpitant with interest in its behalf, since interest in a cause wakes attention and incites intelligence. Indifference to one's duty towards democracy, that fear of meddling with situations that need mending, is downright political infidelity to the social function imposed by nature and divine destiny.

Incompetency is the third foe. Where agents are incompetent, then democratic government is the worst possible. Incompetence breeds incompetence; than that nothing is more true. Low men, by a law of affinity, will deal only with those who stoop to their level, will naturally antagonize the bigger and better men, and will elect the baser sort. Did this type ever prevail in our country, then would our Democracy quickly disintegrate.

The policy of the hour, the one redeeming security is *education*. Perfect preparedness will be ours only when the making of men, not money or measures, is the palmary ambition



of every democratic educator. We must instil intelligent love of true Democracy. We must have an unfailing care for the individual character. We must lay the Religio-Moral foundation. Our work will be to equip our pupils with right religious and moral principles. There must be no difference between their democracy and their decency of behavior.

### EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS

DR. CLYDE FURST, SECRETARY OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

The arts and sciences, from archaeology to zoology, have long been accustomed to send out expeditions to study facts and conditions in the field. More recently the social sciences have adopted this procedure. Lately the science of education has profited by this means of increasing its body of knowledge and doctrine, in the form that we know as a survey.

#### I

The theory and practice of inspection by an outside authority have long been approved and adopted by armies and navies, in the arts and letters; in manufacture, commerce and finance, and by the educational systems of almost every country other than our own. Such aid, however, was definitely rejected by education in the United States until it was indirectly employed in the co-operative activities of the college entrance examination and certificate boards, of the regional associations of schools and colleges, and of professional organizations like the American Medical Association. The accomplishment of these bodies made it evident that the results of disinterested, expert appraisal of educational phenomena were so valuable that the process, instead of being avoided deserved hearty approval and general application. The new educational and social foundations, moreover, soon after their establishment entered upon studies of their fields, which, carried out with adequate resources and unhampered by local or institutional limitations, resulted in surveys that were of conspicuous public service. Immediately thereafter, with one of the complete revulsions that are characteristic of education in the United States, institutions, school systems, and state and federal educational authorities began with one accord to commend and demand and produce surveys. Appearing at the rate of first a dozen, then a score, now a hundred a year, their end is

not yet. In short, surveys have become the spring style in education, with the demand far exceeding the supply.

Whenever and wherever demand exceeds supply, adulteration is likely to occur. This situation has already arisen in the making of educational surveys. Whereas few methods of ascertaining truth are superior to the direct and careful scrutiny of facts by competent, experienced and judicious observers, the number of such observers is strictly limited, and more than one survey has already yielded to the temptation to employ quicker and more easily available methods. The questionnaire has blossomed into a new popularity, in spite of its deserved reputation for yielding inaccurate and unrepresentative results—a recent study generalized concerning the teachers of the entire nation on the basis of replies from one-fifth of the teachers in a single state. Unjustifiable faith, also, is being placed in statistical methods when employed by the trustful and inexperienced. Figures are being studied instead of educational facts—although the reported attendance at almost all schools, colleges, and universities is based, not on the actual number of students in residence but on the total number of those who have registered at any time during the year. We revel in averages, forgetting that they obscure the best and the worst features of any situation. Having achieved statistics, we fail to interpret them. Does dropping one-half of a freshman class for poor work mean that the standard of teaching is high, or that the standard of admission is low? Does a generous per capita expenditure and a small number of graduates mean that an institution is exceptionally effective, or that it is blundering and wasteful? There is less danger in employing tests and scales, of which the better surveys have made commendable use, basing upon them valuable impersonal conclusions, increasing the amount of material available for scientific study, and considerably advancing the development of the tests themselves. Yet here, also, the layman may easily err, for it remains to be proved that many popular tests—such as writing the opposites of words—really measure the kinds of ability and accomplishment that education seeks to promote.

We are on firmer ground in considering facts by means of the comparative method. This has long been employed successfully in other fields, and has long been used informally in educational studies, but never so thoroughly or so helpfully as in the

formal surveys. Comparison between classes has shown that marks in elective courses are higher than those in required courses. Comparison between teachers has shown that to some the mark of A represents unattainable perfection, while others religiously give A's to one-third of every class. Comparison between methods of admission has indicated that students who enter by examination do better work in college than those who enter by certificate. Comparison between institutions showed, a few years ago, that of students entering Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Princeton, less than half met the requirements for admission. Comparison between states has shown that New York has the most effective supervision of education, although not without a touch of bureaucracy; that in New Jersey and Virginia alone there is no state provision for the higher education of women; that Pennsylvania has more colleges than any other state, but that only a dozen states spend as little per student; that Maryland distributes public funds to more privately controlled institutions than any other state. Comparison of regions suggests inquiry as to why the Associations of Colleges and Secondary Schools of New England and of the Middle States admit any institution which desires their fellowship, while the North Central and the Southern Associations of Colleges and Secondary schools have fixed requirements for admission which have done much to raise academic standards throughout their regions. International comparisons remind us that education has no seat in our national cabinet, as it has in England, France, and Italy. The repeated call to the premierships of the ministers of education in those countries indicates that the post commands the best available ability, which it deserves. In our government, on the other hand, education is represented by a minor bureau, subject not to the encouragement but to the restriction of a largely unrelated department—this in a country where the prestige and the problems of education are unparalleled. In short, it is obvious that surveys are most likely to be useful when they consider the facts in hand against the largest comparative background. In using the comparative method one must, of course, guard against the temptation to seek and recommend an artificial uniformity—to which we are already too prone—or to attempt to transfer devices that are successful only where they are indigenous. When one survey reported that the schools of Baltimore had too little central supervision and another

found that the schools of New York had too much, both probably were right. Variation is the source of evolution.

The danger that has just been mentioned is obviated by the historical method, a time-tested procedure which is almost essential in a thorough survey. The light of the past is indispensable for the illumination of the present. Only the historical method places in proper perspective the accomplishment of those disingenuous but not uncommon persons who quickly reform evils that are discovered and then claim a blameless record. The college which under public compulsion suddenly adopts respectable requirements is not, all claims to the contrary notwithstanding, so good as the college that has always had them. Some striking results are being obtained by continuing the work of a survey throughout a series of years. Apparently such continuity alone can bring about the reform of certain long-standing evils. A decade of discussion has failed to persuade the District of Columbia of the iniquity of the law that allows any half dozen persons, without fitness or resources, without formality other than a declaration of intention, to constitute themselves a university at the national capitol. It may take half a century of observation, record, and demonstration to remedy this abuse.

## II

The multiplication of surveys has already stimulated an improvement in the presentation of data in periodical school reports, which have hitherto been so frequently unintelligent and unintelligible, and has generally increased the dissemination of accurate and vivid educational information. We depend so much upon print that anything which vitalizes this "very bloodless substitute for life" is more than welcome. Most of us who are engaged in education, moreover, are easily beset with the sin of taking the will for the deed, of mistaking intention for accomplishment, of being so absorbed with plans for the future that we do not realize the actual conditions of the present. There are common drinking cups and inside bedrooms in our leading institutions. Surveys provide wholesome correction for all of this, by their accurate and specific record of actual facts and conditions, their picture, to use a locution of the department stores, of education "as is."

The attention inevitably given by surveys to measurable results, places a helpful emphasis upon aspects of education that

are apt to be neglected, and this is true also of educational processes. The mere information contained in a comprehensive survey has more than once radically changed fundamental procedure. Thus, Mr. Kingsley's study of college entrance requirements in 1913 has helped greatly to free secondary schools from the burden of preparing students to enter particular colleges, by providing a list of colleges which approve the studies that the schools themselves think is best to prescribe. Similarly, the publication by several southern states of the high school records of all college freshmen, has caused scores of colleges hastily to abandon their low and shifting entrance requirements.

Surveys are also testing and sometimes disproving a considerable number of educational ideas which have been adopted without sufficient evidence. Thus the ratings given by the engineering corporations to their employees who are college graduates, were considered highly significant until they were shown by tests to be considerably less accurate than college marks. Detachment from controversial questions, so abundant in education, often enables a survey not only to solve local problems but also to provide evidence concerning the value or expediency of broader theories. Hence, although apparently immersed in the practical and immediate, surveys may make important contributions to educational philosophy.

How many teachers, moreover, need to be emancipated from the influence of the law of laziness, disguised as a comfortable conservatism, believing that whatever is, is right. One of the publications of the International Commission on the Teaching of Mathematics declared not long since that whoever understands that subject can teach it—an astounding assertion in this day of enlightenment concerning the theory and practice of teaching. Provided, however, that learning is actually advancing, we must sometimes curb our impatience at her snail-like pace. It was really a decided gain when, after a survey, the department of economics at Harvard announced its discovery that students gain more when they are told to look for particular things in their reading—a hoary commonplace of educational method. Reforms cannot work faster than existing agencies will move.

Local history and tradition often build up complexities of organization, administration, and routine which have no reason

behind them, yet completely subjugate those who are habituated to them. The outside observer, possessing what painters call "a fresh eye," can easily point out the unnecessary and often harmful character of such routine, and the honest administrator rewards him with a joy of emancipation which is often pathetic. I know of an instance in which a visitor in one day relieved a college office of ten thousand unnecessary operations.

Pressure of local conditions, also, often makes an institution accept as natural and inevitable, situations which are obviously absurd or worse to the detached observer. Thus colleges which cannot see how to avoid giving more honorary than regular degrees, or why the athletic coach should not have the control of forty scholarships, may be extricated from their predicaments by an authoritative statement of the generally accepted standards in such matters. Similarly informed and disinterested opinion may overcome the insistence of the treasurer of a suburban college that students should journey to his office in the city to pay their fees. A few generally known facts may convince those responsible for the conduct of an institution of their mistake in believing that fifteen thousand dollars will purchase the best engineering equipment in the country, or that fifty thousand dollars will endow a school of architecture, or that a million dollars will equip and endow graduate schools of commerce, education, engineering, jurisprudence, and public health.

One of the advantages that a survey may and usually does have, is its impersonality. Many unfortunate educational situations are due to the holding of important offices by those whose unsuitability is generally recognized, but whose entrenchment is secure against ordinary attack. In such circumstances an honest survey is a powerful agent for reform. Its report will probably be attacked as partisan by the spoilsmen, and spoilsmen have occasionally used partisan surveys for their own purposes, but in general the survey of unquestionable integrity and competence has been an invincible weapon in freeing public welfare from subjection to private ambition and private gain. The children of darkness cannot endure the light. Since, indeed, such studies are scarcely worth the trouble if faults are not discovered and remedies recommended, the publication of each able report is likely to be met with more or less objection from those whose theory or practice it opposes. I know of one imitation college which, when



its dishonest methods were displayed, served legal notice that the surveyors must pay damages for in any way injuring whatever the institution chose to consider its business. A single phrase from another study was for months a bone of contention between two supreme court justices, each supported by a group of captains of industry with their cohorts. Such tumult and shouting are often sufficiently disconcerting, but they soon die away, and the truth transpires and prevails. Experience shows that threatened libel suits are never pressed against those who tell nothing but the truth, and that the favorite attack upon a survey—the charge that it is “self-appointed”—can always be met in advance, by making sure that the invitation to the undertaking is authoritative and representative.

Such loud reverberations, also, are often merely somewhat startling signs of public interest. Having been originally organized and being still generally sponsored by the consumers rather than the producers of education, surveys mark a new, important, and still increasing popular interest in the processes and results of the profession of teaching. People desire to be assured that the money they provide for education is well spent, and they often have decided opinions as to whether the training their children receive is worth while. The ultimate aim of education being social, it is more than desirable for educators to be able to justify their work in the court of public opinion. Where, as recently in New York, the schools become a political issue, they may suffer serious injury unless the public is helped really to understand them.

### III

So new and so popular a movement has inevitably developed a few surveyors who have assumed an attitude of

“I am monarch of all I survey,  
My right there is none to dispute.”

A certain number of others complacently utter

“An undisputed thing,  
In such a solemn way.”

The competence that is indispensable for a valuable result lies midway between these extremes. No subject touches life on more sides than education. Every educational question is



related to economic, political, and social conditions. The educational problems of a state, a city, a single institution, are so complex and so intertwined with other relations that the wisest may well hesitate to attempt their solution. Observation must be patient and thorough. Conclusions of clarity and solidity result only from thorough consideration. Educational surveys made by young or inexperienced people, however, gifted, or in the borrowed part-time of otherwise competent authorities, are rarely satisfactory. The number of those that are qualified to make educational surveys is exceedingly limited. They require not only unusual training and experience, but natural gifts of observation, penetration, and judgment which are more than rare. If the problem is extensive, a large staff of all sorts of experts is required.

A thorough educational survey of any considerable body of material, moreover, requires ample time—frequently a year or a series of years. There is often pressure to have a report completed for presentation at some particular juncture—an anniversary, a sitting of a legislature, or what not. Such immediate usefulness, however, is far less important than the longer, almost unlimited influence which may be exercised by a thorough survey. Hurried, superficial, and ill-considered studies are worse than none. A sound study growing out of some immediate need may, however, provide not only specific aid but also consideration and conclusion concerning fundamental matters.

The cost also of a thorough educational survey is considerable. Travel and study in the field are expensive. The time of competent men demands appropriate compensation. Suitable and wide publication is costly. Several surveys have cost fifty thousand dollars each, and they have been well worth the money.

In general surveys have overemphasized the collection of facts. Some studies appear to have attempted, certainly they have accomplished, little else. Like all of the social sciences, education is already over-burdened with facts. What is needed is not so much the collection of further data as more thorough consideration of the data that are already available. In the preparation of several studies that have been conspicuously useful, much less time and effort were expended in collecting material than in exhaustive consideration and complete testing of conclusions. Some

helpful studies have been based entirely upon data that were already in print.

In the matter of conclusions it is ordinarily safest if the conclusions accumulate inductively, along with the collection and consideration of facts. Good, results, however have sometimes been obtained even by the adventurous method of adopting conclusions first and then finding facts to support them. Either method, or any other, is adequate, provided only that the conclusions truly represent the facts, and that the facts, like the colors of the famous painter, are thoroughly mixed with brains. One of the chief opportunities is that for suggestiveness, not only with regard to present details but even more in indicating routes for future progress. A survey needs wide vision. A recent study which recommended a closer relation of the schools to their environment, was justly criticized for failing to recognize that one of the difficulties of the region was that, in the words of a local newspaper, it "had too much environment already."

Editing is of the greatest importance. Much material must be considered and, for a complicated problem, the assistance of numerous specialists is essential. The final report, however, is successful only as it is free from surplusage of detail and if all particular opinions are distilled together into a consistent and clear statement. It may perhaps take a Gladstone to make a budget interesting, yet only a concise and readable report can minister judgment to the people through the popularizing of new facts and views. I have met no one who has succeeded in reading the twenty-five hundred pages of the 1913 survey of the New York City schools, or the thousand wretchedly printed pages of the 1914 survey of the University of Wisconsin. On the other hand, practically everybody who is interested in education has become familiar with the attractive little volumes of the Cleveland survey.

#### IV

Probably the most important of all the results of the survey movement is the encouragement that it has given to the theory and practice of informed self-scrutiny. It is already becoming impossible to find time to examine all of the surveys that appear, but a reading of the summaries of them that are provided by the United States Bureau of Education, a study of selected surveys, and a use of the increasingly available tests and scales, will enable

any institution to emulate the helpful studies of their own problems made by Oberlin, the University of Illinois, Miami and the College of the City of New York, and may even encourage them to follow the example of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in creating a permanent committee of introspection and appointing a permanent director of research for educational processes. Such officers have already rendered conspicuous service to the city school systems of Boston, New York and New Orleans.

It may be asked, in conclusion, what all of these surveys have to do with good teaching. The answer is: little directly, everything indirectly. Organization, theory, experiment, the example of great teachers, the test of public opinion, all have to do with good teaching. As for good teaching itself we have no way of sharply defining and deliberately producing it. Good teaching is really like thinking, which, in Emerson's phrase, is "uncontrolled by will; we can only open our senses and clear away obstructions." In clearing away obstructions and opening the way for good teaching few implements have proven themselves more useful than the educational survey.

#### DISCUSSION

*Dr. Samuel P. Capen, Bureau of Education, Washington.*—I am not sure how far it is becoming for one whose principal occupation for more than two years has been that of a surveyor to sit in judgment on educational surveys. A certain innocence and detachment are necessary qualifications for a critic. I can claim neither; but if I may hazard a few general observations by way of introduction I should like to record myself as in agreement with most of Dr. Furst's positions. I too regard the survey movement as a wholesome tendency in education. It signalizes the recognition of the value of expert examination and advice. Therefore it represents another step toward the professionalization of educational administration and of teaching.

On the other hand, I think I perceive as clearly as does Dr. Furst the manifest defects of the surveys thus far made. They are chiefly disappointing in two respects. Generally they lack imaginative statesmanship, and they reveal the scarcity of accepted standards of measurement by which educational and administrative processes may be estimated.

If time permitted I think I could account for and in part palliate both of these defects. It might even be possible to show

that most surveys accomplish their purpose, in spite of them. For after all, the shortcomings of survey reports are more apparent to the student of educational literature than to the community whose institutions are being examined. But I assume that place is made in your program for a representative of the Bureau of Education rather than that you may hear something of the Bureau's activities as a surveying agency, and to this topic I will address myself.

The Bureau of Education has conducted or assisted in some twenty educational surveys. No other person or institution has made so many, I believe. Surveying is indeed coming to be one of the Bureau's principal occupations. The reports of most of these investigations have been published or are on the way to be published. Any citizen of the United States may secure them on demand and may applaud or condemn them individually or in bulk. Several citizens have availed themselves of all these opportunities. Some of the things they have said have been true. I can admit so much without appearing in the role of either critic or defender.

You may be interested to know why the Bureau has added educational surveying to its tasks. Although established primarily as an agency for recording by statistical means and otherwise the progress of American education, the Bureau has come to have a considerable influence as the years have passed in shaping the policies and determining the standards of educational institutions. This influence is stronger in some sections of the country than in others. It has never been exercised in a coercive way in any section. It is wholly appropriate, however, that the national repository of information respecting educational matters should be called upon by school officers for constructive suggestion and advice. The present Commissioner has believed from the beginning of his incumbency that the true function of his bureau is to render precisely this service, and he has endeavored to develop its force and equipment with that end in view. He was quick to see the bearings of the survey movement. Probably no more effective method for assisting an institution or an educational system has yet been devised than a well-planned and carefully executed survey—I am not now claiming that all the Bureau's surveys may be thus characterized. The cumulative effect on the educational standards of the country of a considerable number of

surveys made by the same agency and embodying the same basic point of view, is likely to be very great. The Commissioner was convinced that the increasing demand for this kind of investigation presented his office with both an opportunity and a responsibility. Accordingly some three years ago he offered the services of the Bureau in the prosecution of educational surveys, as far as its resources would permit. Since that time the requests for these services have been constant. The Bureau has been able to meet but a fraction of them. Indeed, if its force of investigators were doubled and were relieved of all other duties, they would find full occupation in this field alone.

There is another reason why the Bureau's officers have felt that the making of educational surveys is an appropriate part of their work. Surveys are ticklish things, seldom wholly pleasant to the persons who instigate them, still less to the persons whose activities are examined. There is generally a recoil. In the first heat of the reaction the surveyed are prone to reach for a weapon with which to wreak vengeance upon the surveyor. Two lie ready at hand. You may impugn the surveyor's motives, or you may ridicule his capacity. Now the Bureau of Education enjoys a certain immunity from both these methods of reprisal. It is a public instrument supported by the whole country. It represents no locality or special interest, and therefore cannot possibly be partisan. Moreover, without claiming any peculiar talent for its officers, it is safe to say that they have a wider first-hand acquaintance with educational conditions throughout the country than almost any other group of persons, and behind them stands the accumulated information of half a century. These things do not guarantee the wisdom of any of the Bureau's pronouncements, but they establish a presumption in favor of its honesty and its judgment; which has proved a very present help in time of trouble.

These are some of the reasons why the Bureau of Education has become one of the principal surveying agencies. In response to requests it has examined and reported on the State higher institutions of five States and two private higher institutions, the public school systems of three States, the school systems of three cities, the rural schools of two counties, and the private schools for negroes in the United States. It has under way studies of several other State systems. In the time at my disposal, I could

not of course give a detailed account of even a single one of these investigations. I should like, however, to present some of our points of view.

We believe, with Dr. Furst, that a survey should be constructive. The word is easy to use, and perhaps vague, but it may be illustrated by a few examples. For instance, the Bureau of Education tries to determine what particular purposes an institution or a group of institutions should serve. Are these purposes recognized by the responsible officials? Is there the right form of organization, adequate support, sufficient equipment, a proper teaching staff, efficient and economical management? If not, what steps consonant with past tradition and existing public sentiment may be taken to secure these things? The Bureau has constantly refrained from mere faultfinding. It has never contented itself merely with recording what it sees. It tries also to avoid unnecessary reflections on personalities.

You will observe that the majority of its surveys have dealt with State systems: State higher institutions, or the public schools of a whole State. This has naturally led it to stress in its reports certain aspects of education which might demand less attention in a large city like Boston or St. Louis. It is no secret that the organization of public education in many States leaves much to be desired. The Bureau has therefore especially emphasized questions of organization. It has steadfastly held up principles of efficient organization and control: appointive, nonpartisan, long-term boards; the removal of educational institutions from the baneful influence of politics; the location of power and responsibility in the hands of expert executive officers; the limitation of areas of supervision, etc. These are simple and self-evident postulates perhaps, but experience shows that they come with a shock of novelty to many communities.

I am inclined to think that an equally important feature of practically all of our reports has been the treatment of the question of support for public education. Gradually the Bureau has assembled a rather formidable mass of comparative data bearing on this matter. Since it has not thus far been our lot to survey the most liberal Commonwealth, it has been possible to bring the blush of shame to even the most hardened legislator's cheek by demonstrating the relative niggardliness of his State in its pro-



visions for public institutions. But wholly aside from this stimulus to State rivalry, the Bureau has tried to show that education is an investment and that the more a community lays out the more it may expect to get back. To judge by the immediacy of the response in almost every case, this probably represents the most valuable contribution to the cause of education which has come from the Bureau's surveying activities.

All of the Bureau's later surveys have taken into account the social and economic setting of the institutions studied. A school or a university does not float in a vacuum. It is conditioned by the community which it serves. As communities differ, so do, or should, schools differ. Their courses of study are, or should be, adjusted to the physical environment, the character of the population, the industries, and the professions of the community. This is of course particularly true of the higher institutions. It is true in part of the lower schools also. Strangely enough, the residents of a section are more likely to overlook these important factors in the determination of educational policies than are outsiders. The Bureau of Education has attempted to bring them home to the consciousness of the educational officials at least. The most radical readjustments it has suggested in its recent reports have been based upon studies of the topography, the resources, the population, and the occupations of the several States.

It frequently happens that the principal motive for a State-wide survey or a survey of several more or less competing State higher institutions is the desire to settle a controversy. For example, there is a typical and perennial controversy in nearly every one of the nineteen States which maintain colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts separate from the State university. In many of these States the agricultural college has of late become a technical university. The university, on the other hand, if it has followed the trend of modern education and responded to the demand for practical training of professional grade, has tended also to become a technical university. Shall there be two? How much of the State appropriations for higher education shall each institution receive? What portion of the field of higher education shall each institution cover? In the attempt to find an answer to these questions war bands of loyal alumni harry the State, politicians bleed and die, presidents are led



helpless to the guillotine, education is outraged and despised of men. Indeed, the harmonious and economical adjustment of these two types of institutions to the performance of the State's educational task, the establishment of definite and equitable relations between them constitute possibly the greatest problem in educational administration in the United States. In the present irritated condition of public sentiment in these afflicted areas, I think it safe to say that the problem could not possibly be solved by insiders.

The Bureau of Education has been elected arbiter of the dispute in some four States. In my own opinion the most striking and novel of its contributions to the literature of surveying are its pronouncements on the interrelations of these land-grant colleges and the separate State universities. The Bureau has emphasized the State point of view. No institution lives for itself alone. No upright or patriotic institutional official can seek the aggrandizement of his institution at the expense of the State's interests. The service of the State is the touchstone by which every educational policy must be tested. This is not unheard-of doctrine, yet in many States it appears to have been forgotten. The Bureau's novel contribution, however, is the principle it has proposed for adjusting the work between two overlapping State-supported higher institutions. This is the principle of major and service lines. As it has been much commented upon in the public press, I should like to say a word about it.

The principle is based on the assumption that the duplication by two or more State-supported institutions of the fundamental collegiate courses is necessary, desirable, and not uneconomical. Duplication of expensive professional training, however, is, except in the richest and most populous States, an unwarranted and perverse extravagance. Now the subtle development of this type of duplication may be avoided if the State authorities will apply to the institutions the principle of major and service lines.

In accordance with this principle each institution should have assigned to it certain major fields which it should develop as fully as may be practicable. Literature, history, philosophy, medicine, at the university are such major lines; at the agricultural college, agriculture and home economics.

Service lines are such subordinate subjects as are essential to the proper cultivation of a major line. The amount required

in these lines varies, but is generally not very full or comprehensive. The modern languages are service lines at the agricultural college; home economics at the university. Institutions may well overlap as regards the relation of their service lines to one another, and more particularly as regards the relation of their major to their service lines. English is a major line at the university, a service line at the agricultural college. There should be no material overlapping of major lines.

All critics of surveys and most surveyors note the scarcity of devices for measuring either administration or teaching and the inadequacy of those that exist. I suppose nearly every surveyor has tried to invent some new unit of measurement or has attempted some new application of units already elsewhere employed. The Bureau of Education has done both these things. Its experiences here have been both astounding and salutary. Persons who could find no particular fault with the broader and more constructive aspects of its reports have attacked these details. Their relative importance has been magnified. Moreover, the opinion has been repeatedly expressed that having proposed certain standards and having suggested certain tentative methods of estimating various phases of academic procedure, the Bureau stands committed to the defense of these devices, however defective later investigations may prove them to be. This is absurd, and the absurdity is apparent to anyone who will take the trouble to review the Bureau's reports chronologically. From such a review it will appear that we have constantly refined and improved our units of measurement. If any one of them has been shown to be mistaken or misleading, it has not been used again. The Bureau recognizes that surveys are still in the experimental stage. It does the best it can with the means available. As soon as better means are developed it adopts them and discards the old. Our position is, moreover, that every survey stands on its own bottom. It proves its own case, or it is a failure. The Bureau assumes no pontifical attitude to protect its products from criticism or attack. A few of the standards and units which have been proposed in the Bureau's surveys seem to have commended themselves to institutional officers and to other investigators. As time goes on they appear to be increasingly useful in our own studies also. I am disposed to believe that these may be counted

among the Bureau's definite contributions to the technique of educational engineering.

Probably the supreme gift of the surveyor is the gift of prophetic vision. If he can see farther and more clearly than those who labor with the machinery of teaching and administering, and if he can persuade them to believe in his vision and to follow it, then he has indeed been constructive. This is the determining characteristic of a really fruitful survey. Whether any of our work meets this final test or not, I can not say. I know, however, that it has been the Bureau's earnest effort to look beyond the immediate future, to foresee the development of both a community and its institutions and to suggest policies which may be helpful for many years to come. Time alone will tell whether its forecasts have been correct.

In discussing these papers, *Professor Arthur J. Jones* (University of Pennsylvania), made the following points:

The educational surveys are another evidence of the development of a profession of teaching and have been of tremendous value in many ways. Our difficulty in the way of the survey is to decide upon what the desirable results of education actually are. An evidence of this uncertainty is seen in the statistics presented to show the success of the junior high school. Some statistics show a decrease in the percent. of elimination at the end of the ninth grade, others an increase. Some show a decrease in the number of average pupils in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades and others show an increase. This corresponds, in each case, to the opinion of the surveyor regarding the desirability of such a decrease or increase in the elimination or in the amount of overageness.

In spite of crudities and absurdities manifest in some of the surveys, they have had a great influence upon educational thought. They have emphasized the need for a clear, definite statement of the aim of education—such a statement as will aid the teacher in the everyday work of the school. Face to face with the problem of measuring results, the surveyor must establish definite aims. This statement must be in terms of specific changes to be made in individuals, and must be in terms of habits, attitudes and ideals. The influence of the surveys in this direction is shown in the scales and standards already established and in use, such as those in spelling, in writing, and in arithmetic; standards for attainment

in each grade have also been tentatively formulated. The surveys have also been of great assistance in the correction of such scales and standards. The danger in such definite formulation of the aim of education and in narrowing the consideration of results to those things that can now be definitely measured must be recognized and is usually recognized by the surveyor. Such definite measurements should prove to be an aid rather than a hindrance to the development of the so-called higher, intangible, spiritual aims.

Another thing which the surveys have emphasized is the need of constant, continuous self-examination by educational experts in the system to be examined, and by the teachers themselves, of themselves. The surveys are making it possible for teachers to secure more or less definite standards by means of which they can judge themselves and their own work. This is good pedagogy—to place in the individual a certain standard and make him want to attain it, and give him the means by which he can measure himself by that standard and tell to what degree he has attained it. This is made more nearly possible by the surveys and represents a decided advance in education.

## LIST OF MEMBERS, 1917-18\*

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Adelphi Academy.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Eugene C. Adler, A.B., A.M.
Adelphi College.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clif- ton Pl., St. James Pl. and Lafayette Av.).....	Frank D. Blodgett.
Agnes Irwin School.....	Philadelphia (2011 De Lancey Pl.).....	Josephine A. Natt.
Albright College.....	Myerstown, Pa.....	L. C. Hunt.
Alcuin Preparatory School....	New York City (11½ West 86th St.)....	Miss Grace Kupfer.
Alfred University .....	Alfred, N. Y.....	Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D.
Allegheny College.....	Meadville, Pa.....	William H. Crawford, D.D.
Allentown Preparatory School.	Allentown, Pa.....	Frank G. Rigman.
Asbury Park High School....	Asbury Park, N. J...	Charles F. Huff.
Baldwin School .....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Elizabeth F. Johnson.
Baltimore City College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Wilbur F. Smith.
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute	Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.)....	William R. King, U.S.N.
Barnard School for Boys.....	New York City (721 St. Nicholas Av.)..	Wm. Livingston Hazen.
Barnard School for Girls.....	New York City (421 West 148th St.)...	Wm. L. Hazen.
Barringer High School.....	Newark, N. J.....	Wayland E. Stearns.
Bennett School .....	Millbrook, N. Y.....	Miss May E. Bennett.
Berkeley Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (181 Lincoln Pl.).....	Miss Ina C. Atwood.
Berkeley-Irving School .....	(309 W. 83d St.) New York City...	Lewis Dwight Ray, Ph. D.
Bernardsville High School....	Bernardsville, N. J...	William J. Bickett.
Bethlehem Preparatory School	Bethlehem, Pa.....	John M. Tuggey.
Birmingham School for Girls.	Birmingham, Pa.....	A. R. Grier.
Blair Academy.....	Blairstown, N. J.....	John C. Sharpe.
Bordentown Military Inst.....	Bordentown, N. J...	Col. Thompson D. Landon, D.D.
Boys' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Arthur L. Jones.
Boys' High School.....	Reading, Pa.....	Robert S. Birch.
Brearley School.....	New York City (60 East 61st St.)....	Carl Van Doren, Ph.D.
Bryn Mawr College.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	M. Carey Thomas, Ph.D., LL.D.
Bryn Mawr School.....	Baltimore, Md. (Ca- thedral and Pres- ton Sts.).....	Edith Hamilton.
Bucknell University.....	Lewisburg, Pa.....	John H. Harris, D.D.
Bushwick High School.....	400 Irving Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y....	Frank Rollins.
Canisius College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	Rev. Augustine A. Miller, S.J.
Catholic University of America	Washington, D. C....	Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.
Central High School.....	Altoona, Pa.....	George D. Robb.
Central High School.....	Harrisburg, Pa.....	Howard G. Dibble.
Central High School.....	Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)...	Robert Ellis Thompson, Ph.D., D. D.
Chapin's School (Miss).....	32 East 57th St., New York, N. Y.....	(Miss) M. C. Fairfax.
Chester High School.....	Chester, Pa.....	G. W. Gulden.
Chestnut Hill Academy.....	Chestnut Hill, Pa...	James L. Patterson.
Colgate University.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	Elmer Burritt Bryan, LL.D.
College for Women.....	Allentown, Pa.....	William F. Curtis, President.
College of the City of New York .....	New York City.....	Sydney Edward Mezes, Ph.D., LL.D.
College of New Rochelle.....	New Rochelle, N. Y.	Sister M. Irene.

\*Members are requested to send the Secretary notice of any changes to be made in this list. The only degrees printed are those of the doctorate, in order to ensure correct addressing.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
College of St. Elizabeth.....	Convent, N. J.....	Sister Mary Pauline Kelligar.
Collegiate School .....	New York City (241 W. 77th St.).....	Arthur F. Warren.
Columbia Grammar School....	New York City (34 E. 51st St.).....	Benjamin Howell Campbell.
Columbia High School.....	Columbia, Pa.....	Mary Y. Welsh.
Columbia University .....	New York City.....	Nicholas Murray Butler, LL.D.
Commercial High School.....	Newark, N. J.....	William Wiener.
Cornell University .....	Ithaca, N. Y.....	J. G. Schurman, LL.D.
Dearborn-Morgan School ....	Orange, N. J.....	(Miss) C. R. Clark.
Delaware College .....	Newark, Del.....	S. C. Mitchell, Ph.D.
DeWitt Clinton High School..	New York City.....	Francis H. J. Paul.
Dickinson College .....	Carlisle, Pa.....	James H. Morgan, Ph.D.
Drew Seminary.....	Carmel, N. Y.....	Rev. Clarence P. McClelland.
Drexel Institute.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Hollis Godfrey, Sc. D.
Eastern District High School..	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Marcy Ave. and Keap St.) .....	William T. Vlymen, Sc.Ph.D.
Eastern High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	E. J. Becker, D.D.
East High School.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	W. C. Davis.
Easton High School.....	Easton, Pa.....	Ralph E. Files.
East Orange High School.....	East Orange, N. J....	Elisa Kellas, Ph.D.
Emma Willard School.....	Troy, N. Y.....	Winton J. White.
Englewood High School.....	Englewood, N. J.....	Rev. Philip J. Steinmetz, Jr.
Episcopal Academy.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	J. H. Low.
Erasmus Hall High School....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Franklin C. Lewis.
Ethical Culture School.....	New York City (Central Park W. and 63d St.).....	Gilbert S. Blakely.
Evander Childs High School..	New York City.....	E. M. Hartman.
Franklin and Marshall Acad...	Lancaster, Pa.....	T. G. Helm.
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster, Pa.....	Rev. Henry Harbaugh Apple, D.D.
Franklin School.....	New York City.....	Friedrich Otto Koenig, J.U.D.
Friends' Central School.....	Philadelphia (15th and Race Sts.)....	John W. Carr, Ph.D.
Friends' School.....	Park Place, Baltimore, Md.....	E. C. Wilson.
Friends' School.....	Wilmington, Del....	Herschel A. Norris.
Friends' Select School.....	Philadelphia (140 N. 16th St.).....	Walter W. Haviland.
Friends' Seminary.....	New York City (226 E. 16th St.).....	John L. Carver.
Gallaudet College.....	Washington, D. C...	Percival Hall.
George School.....	George School, Pa...	George A. Walton.
Georgetown College.....	Washington, D. C...	Rev. A. J. Donlon, S.J.
George Washington University	Washington, D. C...	Chas. Herbert Stockton, LL.D.
Germantown Academy.....	Philadelphia (Gtn.)..	Samuel E. Osbourn.
Germantown Friends' School..	Germantown, Phila. (Coulter St.) .....	Stanley R. Yarnall.
Germantown High School.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Harry F. Keller, Ph.D.
Gilman Country School.....	Roland Park, Md....	Frank Woodworth Pine.
Girls' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	W. L. Felter, Ph.D.
Goucher College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	William Westley Guth, Ph.D.
Gunston Hall.....	Washington, D. C. (1906 Florida Av.)	Mrs. Beverly R. Mason.
Hackensack High School.....	Hackensack, N. J....	George L. Bennett.
Halsted School.....	Yonkers, N. Y.....	Mary Sicard Jenkins.
Hamilton College.....	Clinton, N. Y.....	Frederick C. Ferry, LL.D.
Haverford College.....	Haverford, Pa.....	William W. Comfort, Ph.D.



INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Haverford School.....	Haverford, Pa.....	E. M. Wilson.
Hill School.....	Pottstown, Pa.....	Dwight R. Meigs.
(Miss) Hills' School for Girls	1808 Spruce St., Phila	Mrs. Elizabeth Hills Lyman.
Hobart College.....	Geneva, N. Y.....	Lyman P. Powell.
Holman School for Girls.....	Philadelphia (2004 Walnut St.).....	Elizabeth Braley.
Holton Arms School.....	Washington, D. C. (2125 S St.).....	Mrs. Jessie M. Holton.
Hood College.....	Frederick, Md.....	Joseph H. Apple, Pd.D.
Horace Mann School for Boys	W. 246th St., New York, N. Y. ....	Virgil Prettyman, Ph.D.
Horace Mann School for Girls	New York City (120th St. and Broadway)	Henry C. Pearson.
Howard University.....	Washington, D. C..	Stephen M. Newman.
Hunter College of the City of New York .....	New York City.....	George S. Davis, Ph.D.
Jamaica High School.....	Jamaica, N. Y. City.	Theodore C. Mitchell.
Johns Hopkins University....	Baltimore, Md.....	Frank J. Goodnow, LL.D.
Julia Richman High School...	New York, N. Y....	Michael H. Lucy.
Juniata College .....	Huntingdon, Pa.....	J. Harvey Brumbaugh, Ph.D.
Kent Place School.....	Summit, N. J.....	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Lafayette College.....	Easton, Pa.....	John H. MacCracken, Ph.D., LL.D.
La Salle College.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Rev. Brother Richard.
Lawrenceville School .....	Lawrenceville, N. J..	S. J. McPherson, Ph.D.
Lebanon Valley College.....	Annaville, Pa.....	G. G. Gossard, D.D.
Lehigh University.....	S. Bethlehem, Pa....	Henry Sturgis Drinker, LL.D.
Leonia High School.....	Leonia, N. J.....	F. M. Garver.
Linden Hall Seminary.....	Lititz, Pa.....	Rev. F. W. Stengel.
Loyola School.....	New York City (65 E. 83d St.).....	J. Havens Richards, S.J.
McDonogh School.....	McDonogh, Md.....	M. H. Bowman, Jr.
Mackenzie School.....	Monroe, N. Y.....	Rev. James C. Mackenzie, Ph.D.
(Miss) Madeira's School....	Washington, D. C. (1326 19th St.)....	Lucy Madeira Wing.
Maher Preparatory School....	Philadelphia (With- erspoon Bldg.)....	John F. Maher.
Manhattan College.....	New York City (Grand Boulevard and 131st St.)....	Rev. Brother Edward.
Manual Training and High School .....	Camden, N. J.....	Clara S. Burrough.
Manual Training High School	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Charles D. Larkins.
Maryland State Normal School	Baltimore, Md.....	Henry S. West.
Massee Country School.....	Bronxville, New York	W. W. Massee, Ph.D.
(Misses) Masters' School....	Dobb's Ferry, N. Y..	The Misses Masters.
Mercersburg Academy.....	Mercersburg, Pa....	William Mann Irvine, Ph.D.
Milne High School.....	Albany, N. Y.....	John M. Sayles.
Mohegan Lake School.....	Mohegan, N. Y.....	Albert E. Linder.
Montclair Academy.....	Montclair, N. J.....	John G. MacVicar.
Montclair High School.....	Montclair, N. J.....	H. W. Dutch.
Moravian College and Theo- logical Seminary .....	Bethlehem, Pa.....	Albert G. Rau, Ph.D., Dean.
Moravian Seminary and Col- lege for Women.....	Bethlehem, Pa.....	Rev. J. H. Clewell, Ph.D.
Morris High School.....	New York City (Bos- ton Road and 166th St.) .....	John H. Denbigh.
Morristown School.....	Morristown, N. J....	Arthur P. Butler.
Mount Vernon Seminary.....	Washington, D. C...	Miss Adelia G. Hensley.
Muhlenberg College.....	Allentown, Pa.....	Rev. John A. W. Haas, D.D.



INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Narberth High School.....	Narberth, Pa.....	William T. Melchior.
Newark Academy.....	Newark, N. J.....	Wilson Farrand.
New York Military Academy.	Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y.....	Sebastian C. Jones.
New York State College.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Abraham R. Brubacher.
New York University.....	New York City.....	Elmer Ellsworth Brown, LL.D.
Northeast High School for Girls .....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	William D. Lewis, Ph.D.
Northeast High School for Boys .....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Ogontz School .....	Elkins Park, Pa.....	Mrs. Abby A. Sutherland Brown.
Packer Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Edward J. Goodwin, Ph.D.
Park School .....	Baltimore, Md.....	Eugene R. Smith.
Passaic High School.....	Passaic, N. J.....	Fred S. Shephard.
Paterson High School.....	Paterson, N. J.....	Francis R. North.
Peddle Institute .....	Hightstown, N. J.....	Roger W. Swetland.
Penn Hall School for Girls..	Chambersburg, Pa..	F. S. Magill.
Pennsylvania College .....	Gettysburg, Pa.....	W. A. Granville.
Pennsylvania State College....	State College, Pa.....	E. E. Sparks, Ph.D.
Perkiomen Seminary .....	Pennsburg, Pa.....	Rev. O. S. Kriebel.
Philadelphia High School for Girls .....	17th and Spring Gar- den Sts.....	Fred S. Gowing.
Philadelphia Normal School for Girls .....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	J. Eugene Baker.
Pingry School.....	Elizabeth, N. J.....	C. Mitchell Froelicher, B.A.
Princeton High School.....	Princeton, N. J.....	Miss M. T. Vanderbilt.
Princeton University.....	Princeton, N. J.....	John G. Hibben, LL.D.
Reading High School for Girls	Reading, Pa.....	Miss Mary H. Mayer.
Ridgely Park High School	Ridgely Park, N. J.	Oscar E. Swanson.
Riverview Academy .....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y..	Joseph B. Bisbee.
Rutgers College .....	New Brunswick, N.J.	W. H. S. Demarest, D.D.
Rutgers Preparatory School ..	New Brunswick, N. J.	Wm. P. Kelly.
St. Agatha .....	New York City (553 West End Av.)...	Emma G. Sebring.
St. Agnes School.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Matilda Gray.
St. John's College.....	Annapolis, Md.....	Thomas Fell, LL.D.
St. John's College, Fordham University .....	New York City.....	Rev. Joseph A. Mulry.
St. John's College.....	Washington, D. C....	Brother D. Edward.
St. John's School.....	Manlius, N. Y.....	William Verbeck.
St. Lawrence University.....	Canton, N. Y.....	Almon Gunnison, DD., LL.D.
St. Luke's School.....	Wayne, Pa.....	Charles Henry Strout.
St. Paul's School.....	Garden City, L. I..	Walter R. Marsh.
St. Stephen's College.....	Annandale, N. Y....	Rev. William C. Rodgers, D.D.
Schuylkill Seminary.....	Reading, Pa.....	Warren F. Teel.
Shady Side Academy.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (5035 Castleman St.)....	Luther B. Adams.
Shippen School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Emily R. Underhill.
Sidwells' Friends' School.....	Washington, D. C (1811 I St., N. W.)	Thomas W. Sidwell.
South Philadelphia High School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Dr. Lucy W. Wilson.
Springside School .....	Chestnut Hill, Pa....	Miss C. S. Jones.
State Model School.....	Trenton, N. J.....	James M. Green, Ph.D., LL.D.
State Normal School.....	West Chester, Pa....	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
Staten Island Academy.....	New Brighton, N. Y.	Frank R. Page.
Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, N. J.....	Alexander C. Humphreys, LL.D.
Stuyvesant High School.....	New York City (345 E. 15th St.).....	Ernest R. Von Nardroff, Ph.D.
Swarthmore College.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	Joseph Swain, LL.D.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Swarthmore High School.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	H. Chalmers Stuart.
Syracuse University.....	Syracuse, N. Y.....	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Technical High School.....	Harrisburg, Pa.....	Charles B. Fager.
Temple College.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Rev. R. H. Conwell
Thurston Preparatory School.	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.).....	Alice M. Thurston.
Tome School for Boys.....	Port Deposit, Md....	Thomas S. Baker, Ph.D.
Trinity School.....	New York City (147 W. 91st St.).....	Rev. Lawrence T. Cole, Ph.D., D.D.
Union College.....	Schenectady, N. Y....	Charles Alexander Richmond, D.D.
University of Buffalo.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	
University of Maryland.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Bernard Carter, LL.D.
University of Pennsylvania....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Edgar F. Smith, Sc.D., LL.D.
University of Pittsburgh.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Grant Blvd.).....	Samuel B. McCormick, D.D., LL.D.
University of Rochester.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Univ. of the State of N. Y....	Albany, N. Y.....	John H. Finley, Ph.D., LL.D.
Ursinus College.....	Collegeville, Pa.....	George L. Omwake, Ph.D.
Vassar College.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y..	Henry Noble MacCracken, LL.D.
Wadleigh High School.....	N. Y. City (114th St. and 7th Av.)..	Stuart H. Rowe.
Washington and Jefferson College .....	Washington, Pa.....	Frederick W. Hinit, D.D., LL.D.
Washington College.....	Chestertown, Md....	James W. Cain, LL.D.
Wells College.....	Aurora, N. Y.....	Kerr D. Macmillan, Ph.D.
Wenonah Military Academy..	Wenonah, N. J.....	Charles H. Lorenee.
West Chester High School...	West Chester, Pa....	R. W. Reckard.
Western High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	David E. Weglein.
Western High School.....	Washington, D. C....	Elmer S. Newton.
West High School.....	Rochester, N. Y....	William M. Bennett.
West Orange High School....	West Orange, N. J..	S. C. Strong.
West Philadelphia High School for Boys.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	C. C. Heyl.
West Philadelphia High School for Girls.....	47th and Walnut Sts., Philadelphia, Pa....	Parke Schoch.
Westtown School .....	Westtown, Pa.....	George Jones.
Wilkes-Barre High School...	Wilkes-Barre, Pa. ...	J. P. Breidinger.
William Penn Charter School.	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Richard M. Gummere, Ph.D.
William Penn High School for Girls .....	Philadelphia (15th and Wallace Sts.)..	W. D. Lewis, Ph.D.
Williamsport Dickinson Seminary .....	Williamsport, Pa....	Rev. B. C. Conner
Wilmington High School.....	Wilmington, Del....	A. Henry Berlin.
Wilson College.....	Chambersburg, Pa...	Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D.
Xavier High School.....	New York City (30 West 16th St.)....	Rev. Thomas White, S.J.
Yeates School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	John H. Schwacke.
Yonkers High School.....	Yonkers, N. Y.....	William A. Edwards.
York Collegiate Institute....	York, Pa.....	Charles H. Ehrenfeld.
Miss Ella Gordon Stuart....	Germantown, Phila., Pa. (155 W. Walnut St.).....	

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1917.

- ALCUIN PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Principals, Blanche Hirsch and Grace H. Kupfer.
- ALLEGHENY COLLEGE, *Meadville, Pa.* President, William H. Crawford.
- BALDWIN SCHOOL (THE), *Bryn Mawr, Pa.* Principal, Elizabeth Forrest Johnson, Grace S. Barker.
- BAY RIDGE HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Principal, Kate E. Turner; Mabel R. Benway, Louisa Bruckman.
- BEACON HIGH SCHOOL, *Beacon, N. Y.* Vice Principal, Mary A. Hall; Wetah A. Smith, Sybil E. Sherwood.
- BENNETT SCHOOL (THE), *Millbrook, N. Y.* Vice Principal, Anne E. Boardman; Marion A. Ballor, Mrs. Louise B. Hill.
- BERKLEY INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Helen C. Wilcox.
- BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL (THE), *Birmingham, Pa.* Head Master, Preston S. Moulton.
- BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Ernest Riess.
- BREARLEY SCHOOL (THE), *New York City, N. Y.* Head Master, Carl Van Doren.
- BROOKLYN TRAINING SCHOOL FOR TEACHERS, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Principal, Emma L. Johnston.
- BUSHWICK HIGH SCHOOL. Principal, Frank Rollins; Bertha K. Dietrich, Florence Hannah.
- CARNEGIE FOUNDATION, *New York City, N. Y.* Secretary, Clyde Furst.
- CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Newark, N. J.* Mary N. Ryce, Daniel C. Knowlton, H. E. Webb.
- CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Harry English.
- CHAUDER'S SCHOOL (MISS), *New York City, N. Y.* Principal, Valentine L. Chauder.
- COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Head Master, Arthur F. Warren.
- COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York, N. Y.* Allan P. Ball, Charles A. Downer, Lewis F. Mott, Livingston R. Schuyler, Holland Thompson.
- COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE, *New Rochelle, N. Y.* Sister M. Irene, Sister M. Loyola.
- COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City, N. Y.* Acting Dean, H. E. Hawkes; John Erskine, Gertrude Hirst, Adam Leroy Jones, Nelson McCrea, Julius Sachs, H. A. Todd, C. Todd.
- DREW SEMINARY FOR YOUNG WOMEN, *Carmel, N. Y.* President, Clarence Paul McClelland.
- DREXEL INSTITUTE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Mabel Dickson Cherry.
- EAST HIGH SCHOOL, *Rochester, N. Y.* Vice Principal, William Betz.
- EAST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL, *East Orange, N. J.* Principal, Ralph E. Files.
- EASTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Easton, Pa.* Principal, W. C. Davis.
- ERASMUS HALL HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Mabel Chesley, Katherine I. Hodgdon, Ruth Trench.

- FRIENDS' ACADEMY, *Moorestown, N. J.* Principal, Alfred L. Deyo; Anne E. Maxfield, Martha E. H. Swan.
- FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Principal, Walter W. Haviland, Caroline E. DeGreene, Mary Doan, Mary Anna Jones, Henry Arnold Todd.
- FRIENDS' CENTRAL SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Principal, J. W. Carr.
- GEORGE SCHOOL, *George School, Pa.* Principal, George A. Walton; Mrs. George A. Walton.
- GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* W. C. Reudiger.
- GERMANTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Germantown, Pa.* Principal, Stanley R. Yarnall; H. Dominovich, Jane S. Jones, Irvin C. Poley, Helen D. White.
- GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Principal, Wm. L. Felter.
- GLEN EDEN SCHOOL, *Poughkeepsie, N. Y.* Alice W. Wilcox.
- GOUCHER COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* Registrar, Carrie Mae Probst.
- HALSTED SCHOOL (THE), *Yonkers, N. Y.* Principal, Mary S. Jenkins.
- HAMILTON COLLEGE, *Clinton, N. Y.* President, Frederick C. Ferry.
- HOBART COLLEGE, *Geneva, N. Y.* Willis P. Woodman.
- HORACE MANN SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *New York City, N. Y.* Head Master, Virgil Prettyman.
- HUNTER COLLEGE OF NEW YORK CITY, *New York.* Adele Bildersee, A. Busse, Elizabeth B. Collier, Mary E. Cramer, Edgar Dawson, Louise T. Fontaine, Luise Hoessler, E. Adelaide Hahn, Emilie O. Long, Anne B. MacLear, Evangeline A. Moon, Mary Percival, Emma W. Requea, Cornelia C. Ward, Meriam Wener, G. M. Mueher, Helen L. Young.
- HUNTER HIGH SCHOOL. Helen I. Hazlet.
- JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *Baltimore, Md.* Dean, Murray P. Brush.
- JULIA RICHMAN HIGH SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* May G. Wendell.
- LADY JANE GRAY SCHOOL, *Binghamton, N. Y.* Principal, Ella Virginia Jones.
- LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, *Easton, Pa.* Dean, Albert K. Heckel; James W. Tupper.
- LA SALLE COLLEGE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Brother Dorotheus.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, *South Bethlehem, Pa.* Secretary, C. L. Thornburg.
- LINDEN HALL, *Lititz, Pa.* President, F. W. Stengel.
- MERCERSBURG ACADEMY, *Mercersburg, Pa.* Registrar, James G. Miller.
- MISS CHAPIN'S SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Katharine Innes Cook.
- MISSSES MASTERS' SCHOOL, *Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.* B. B. Anderson, Anna C. McFadden, H. B. Worrell.
- MONTCLAIR ACADEMY, *Montclair, N. J.* Head Master, John G. MacVicar.
- MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL, *Montclair, N. J.* Mary M. Crawford.
- MORRIS HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Principal, John H. Denbigh, Jennie Acherly.
- NEWARK ACADEMY, *Newark, N. J.* Head Master, Wilson Farrand; Louis A. Roux.

- NEW YORK SCHOOL OF PHILANTHROPY, *New York City, N. Y.* Eleanor B. Negley.
- NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, *Albany, N. Y.* H. Birchenough.
- NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, *New York City, N. Y.* Marshall S. Brown.
- PACKER INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Clara L. Crampton, Minnie E. Waite, Helen L. Slack.
- PARK SCHOOL (THE), *Baltimore, Md.* Head Master, Eugene Randolph Smith.
- PATERSON HIGH SCHOOL, *Paterson, N. J.* M. T. Johnston, Miss Castor, Miss Cuddeback.
- PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Emma L. Berry.
- POUGHKEEPSIE HIGH SCHOOL, *Poughkeepsie, N. Y.* Principal, J. S. Fox; B. Hirman Mattingly.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, *Princeton, N. J.* Dean, Andrew F. West; John Preston Hoskins.
- RIVERDALE COUNTRY SCHOOL, *Riverdale-on-Hudson, N. Y.* Head Master, Frank S. Hackett.
- RUTGERS COLLEGE, *New Brunswick, N. J.* Dean, Louis Bevier.
- ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE, *Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y.* President, William C. Rodgers; Edwin C. Upton.
- SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. Ross Smith.
- SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Principal, Lucy L. W. Wilson; Muriel Brown, Bessie R. Burchett, Amy L. Clapp, Olive Ely Hart, M. Louise Nichols.
- SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, *Swarthmore, Pa.* President, Joseph Swain; vice president, John A. Miller.
- SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, *Syracuse, N. Y.* Dean, W. H. Metzler; Floyd F. Decker, Horace A. Eaton.
- ST. AGATHA SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Miss N. P. Chapin, M. G. Frick.
- ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Annapolis, Md.* Sydney S. Handy.
- ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, *Canton, N. Y.* President, Frank A. Gallop.
- ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL, *Garden City, N. Y.* Head Master, Walter R. Marsh.
- TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Dean, Laura H. Carnell; Sara E. Beardslee.
- UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, *Buffalo, N. Y.* Wilfred H. Shirk.
- UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Geo. Gailey Chambers, George D. Hadzsits, George H. Hallett, Arthur J. Jones, George Wm. McClelland, D. B. Shumway.
- UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* Secretary, S. B. Linhart.
- UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, *Rochester, N. Y.* President, Rush Rhees.
- UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, *Albany, N. Y.* President, John H. Finley; Chas. F. Wheelock, James Sullivan, E. E. Arnold.
- UNION COLLEGE, *Schenectady, N. Y.* President, Charles A. Richmond; John Bennett.
- U. S. ARMY. James R. Angell.
- U. S. BUREAU OF EDUCATION. Samuel P. Capen.

- VASSAR COLLEGE, *Poughkeepsie, N. Y.* Dean, Ella McCaleb; James F. Baldwin, Gertrude Buck, E. B. Cowley, E. Fahnestock, C. F. Fiske, E. D. Fite, E. H. Haight, Abby Leach, Elizabeth H. Palmer, Rose J. Peebles, I. Woodbridge Riley, Lucy M. Salmon, Helen E. Sandison, I. C. Thallon, Mary R. Thayer, C. Mildred Thompson, Margaret F. Washburn, H. S. White, Marian P. Whitney, Laura J. Wylie, L. L. Stroebe.
- WADLEIGH HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City, N. Y.* Anna P. MacVay.
- WELLS COLLEGE, *Aurora-on-Cayuga, N. Y.* President, Kerr D. MacMillan; Florence Risley, Ruby Willis.
- WEST HIGH SCHOOL, *Rochester, N. Y.* Grace N. Malcolm.
- WEST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL, *West Orange, N. J.* Principal, S. C. Strong.
- WESTTOWN SCHOOL, *Westtown, Pa.* Principal, George Jones.
- WILLIAM PENN HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Anna C. Clauder, Jonathan T. Rorer.
- WILMINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Del.* Principal, A. H. Berlin.
- WILSON COLLEGE, *Chambersburg, Pa.* President, Ethelbert D. Warfield.
- YONKERS HIGH SCHOOL, *Yonkers, N. Y.* Lyra Foote Kelly.
- SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, *Diocese of Albany, N. Y.* Dr. Joseph A. Dunney.



